

SEGREGATION AND
COMMON SENSE

O. R. WILLIAMS, Sr.

SEGREGATION AND COMMON SENSE

SEGREGATION and COMMON SENSE

By

O. R. WILLIAMS, Sr.

**FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY,
324 NEWBURY STREET
Boston 15, Massachusetts**

COPYRIGHT 1961 BY O. R. WILLIAMS, SR.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THE MEADOR PRESS, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

DEDICATION

To all persons, of all races, who believe in freedom for all, including racial freedom—the freedom which proclaims the right of all races to protect, in perpetuity, the preservation of their respective racial integrity, I dedicate this little book.

THE AUTHOR.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction	9
I	
The Rights of Man	21
II	
The Rise and Fall of Nations	72
III	
What Does the Negro Want?	104
IV	
The Communists and Integration	118
V	
God and Segregation	129
VI	
Forced Integration is Slavery	165
VII	
The School desegregation Decision is Baseless ..	169
VIII	
The Remedy and What We Can Do	186
IX	
Conclusions	202

INTRODUCTION

That there may be a better understanding as to the necessity, and the justice of racial segregation, I write this little book. Therefore, with this end in view, I will not have too much to say concerning the legal aspects of this important issue; but on the other hand, I will endeavor to determine whether segregation is "Right" or "Wrong"—based on COMMON SENSE, THE RIGHTS OF MAN, and THE RIGHTS OF GOD. This I will do, because—many times—there is a vast difference in a law being legal and a law being "Right." If a thing is "Wrong," no law, or legal authority can make it "Right" by declaring that it is "Right." While on the other hand, if a thing is "Right," no law, or legal authority can make it "Wrong" by proclaiming that it is "Wrong."

Before the Civil War, the Constitution of the United States recognized the institution of slavery; and the Supreme Court, by its decisions, upheld the right to hold human beings in bondage. So, as a result of this, Negroes were forced to perform services for the white people of this Nation. But being recognized by the Constitution and held legal by the Supreme Court did not make the institution "Right," because slavery was "Wrong"; and neither the Constitution, or the Supreme Court could make it "Right" by upholding slavery. Because "Right" is "Right" and "Wrong" is "Wrong"—regardless of any constitution, law, or court decision.

So, it must be obvious, if great issues are to be

settled—based on “Right”—other sources of information must be sought, other than the Constitution and decisions of the Supreme Court. Because—as we have seen—the Constitution and the decisions of the Supreme Court, do not always furnish the needed information by which a “Right” decision—based on “Right” can be made. Because slavery was “Wrong”; yet neither the Constitution, nor the Supreme Court said that it was “Wrong,” prior to the Civil War. Therefore, it is a possibility—if Abraham Lincoln and others—had not looked beyond the Constitution and the decisions of the Supreme Court for guidance, as to whether slavery was “Right” or “Wrong”—that slavery would exist today in these United States.

Now, once again—as it was a hundred years ago—the people of this Nation are faced with a great issue—the issue of racial segregation; and in many respects, it raises questions that are far greater and more important, than the question of slavery. And on this issue of racial segregation, the Constitution has nothing to say—not one word, one way or the other, whether segregation is “Right” or “Wrong.” But in 1896, the Supreme Court ruled that segregation in public schools was Constitutional; but then in 1954, the Supreme Court—turned completely around—and said: segregation in public schools was unconstitutional.

Now, one thing is certain: Both of these decisions cannot be “Right”; neither can both be “Wrong.” Because it is not possible for anything to be “Right” one minute, and then “Wrong” the next minute. But this was the situation on May 17, 1954. On this date, one minute before the Supreme Court rendered its school desegregation decision, segregation was “Right” in public schools; but the next minute—this same date—segregation in public schools was “Wrong”—all

this was said in effect by the Supreme Court of the United States, but on different dates.

Therefore, in view of these facts that cannot be disputed, we, the people of these United States, must look to other sources, besides the Constitution and the Supreme Court, for guidance, as to whether racial segregation is "Right" or "Wrong."

So, with this end in view, I write this little book, which I have named, SEGREGATION AND COMMON SENSE. And as the name implies, I will endeavor—from a common sense viewpoint—to determine whether racial segregation is "Right" or "Wrong." And in doing this, my case in support of racial segregation, will be built upon this foundation: THE RIGHTS OF MAN; and THE RIGHTS OF MAN will be grounded in the laws of nature and the laws of God. I know of no better source than these. Because, in the final analysis, God is the source of all things. And if we know what are the RIGHTS OF MAN; and then, and then only, may we know whether racial segregation is "Right" or "Wrong." So, to this end, I have devoted the first chapter of this book, titled, THE RIGHTS OF MAN.

The issue of racial segregation raises many questions, and one of these questions is this: Will inter-racial marriage between Negroes and whites, produce an inferior race? Well—I have done much research work on this subject. I have read the works of quite a few anthropologists, and this is what I find: those anthropologists, who believe in race-mixing, contend that inter-racial marriage between any of the diverse races of mankind, will not produce an inferior race. And to support this, they point out the hybrid vigor that is obtained by crossbreeding, both plants and animals. But here they stop. They do not tell the whole story

of crossbreeding of plants and animals: They do not tell that for a crossbreeding program—with either plants or animals to be successful—it must be controlled; they do not tell that you cannot breed from the offspring of crossbred animals—without producing an inferior herd; and they do not tell—if a crossbreeding program to be successful—you must, at all times, have pure blood animals to cross. And neither do they tell you—in a nation where inter-racial marriage is permitted—where they are going to get more pure bloods to inter-marry—when the races become amalgamated into one. And remember: you must have pure bloods to inter-marry, otherwise, you will have a mongrel inferior race. No, these anthropologists do not tell the whole truth concerning crossbreeding. But in the chapter: **THE RISE AND FALL OF NATION**, I tell the whole story.

Another question that is often asked: What does the Negro want? Why is the Negro not satisfied to send his children to segregated schools? And why is it that the Negro wants to force the white man to mix and mingle with him in all the various walks of life?

All these are reasonable questions, but the answers given by Negroes are not satisfactory. So, to find the right answer, I have done much research work concerning these questions. I have read the works of many persons, who believe in race-mixing; and all these persons agree on one thing: that there is a large segment of Negroes, who do not like the color of black, when it is applied to themselves; that all these Negroes would like to see their children have a lighter color than themselves; and that in homes, where there are different shades of color, the lighter skin children, always get better treatment. Now, what does all this

mean? It can mean only one thing: That there are many Negroes, who do not like being Negroes; they want to be white people. So, it is just natural that this segment of Negroes would like to see the color of black vanish from the Negro race. But this the Negro cannot do by himself. He must have the help of the white race. To get this help, the white race must be made to associate with Negroes. This, the Negro knows will, sooner or later end in inter-racial marriages. This is what the Negro wants. In the chapter: **WHAT THE NEGRO WANTS**, I will tell the whole story.

But the white race—as a whole—wants no part of inter-racial marriages; they do not want to become a mongrel race by mixing with Negroes; but this is the final goal of those Negroes who are seeking the end of racial segregation. So, if by forcing the races to associate together in schools and other places, the white and Negro races become a mongrel race, then this will be forcing the white race to do a job or a service for the Negro race. And now remember this: whenever any person, or persons are forced to do a job, or to perform a service for others—no matter by what name it may be called—that is slavery. So, as things now stand, the white people of these United States are being forced into slavery—forced into slavery in the service of the Negro race. This, I will discuss in detail in the chapter: **FORCED INTEGRATION IS SLAVERY**.

Many religious organizations, many preachers, and others in the field of religion are demanding the end of racial segregation, on the ground that segregation violates the laws of God. And when they are reminded that God—by creating, and then segregating all the various races by natural barriers—was really

the first segregationist, they react by saying something like this:

"God made man; and from this one man, all the different races were developed by natural processes, such as environmental factors and other natural causes."

So, the literature—concerning the origin of the various races—put out by the religious organizations, and preachers, who are demanding the ending of racial segregation, is like reading a book on the theory of evolution. They seem to think that because God did not create all the races when Adam was created, then God had nothing to do with creating the different races of mankind. But this means nothing. God is all powerful; and because He did not make all races when Adam was created, is no good reason why God could not do this job at a later date. Because—among other things—we have much definite proof that God did not finish all His work when the world and Adam were created. For instance, God did not give Adam the same set of rules to live by that He gave Moses. God commanded Adam and Eve, saying: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it"; and not to eat of "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." But Adam and Eve disobeyed God and were driven from the Garden of Eden. But then God did not give Adam a code of laws to live by; the Ten Commandments were not given to Adam. Adam was only told that death was the penalty for disobeying the commandment not to eat the forbidden fruit; and after Adam and Eve had eaten the forbidden fruit, God only told Adam that he could only eat bread by the sweat of his face.

Now, may I ask, why did God not give Adam a code of laws—such as the Ten Commandments—to live by? And why did God not give the Ten Commandments

to Noah, or Abraham, or Isaac, or some one else, instead of Moses? Did not the people from Adam till Moses need a code of laws by which to live by? If so, then why did God wait so long to do this? Then if the world needs a savior today, did the world not need a savior in the time of Moses? If it did, then why did God wait until 1960 years ago to send His Son, Christ, to save a sinful world?

The answer to these questions is: God was not ready to give the world the Ten Commandments when He created Adam; and neither was He ready to give the world Jesus Christ until 1960 years ago. But when God was ready, He gave the world the Ten Commandments and Christ, His Son. And we know that God did these things, because we have the proof that He did; yet, there is no record in God's word—at the time that Adam was created—that God was going to give the Ten Commandments to Moses; and neither was there any record—at this time—that God was going to give a sinful world His Son, as its Savior 1960 years ago.

Likewise, there is no record in God's word—at the time of Adam—that God was going to create the various races of mankind—sometime in the future. But we have the evidence that all races were created by God, by His own word that He created every thing. (See Col. 1:16) And if God created every thing, then the mere fact that the different races exist, is proof that God was their Creator. And because God did not make all races when He made Adam, is no reason why God is not the Creator of all races. This only proves that God waited until He was good and ready before He made the several races of mankind, just like He did not give the world the Ten Commandments and His Son, Jesus Christ, until He was ready. In the

chapter: GOD AND SEGREGATION, I will tell the whole story.

The School Desegregation Decision of May 17, 1954, was based upon the allegation that it made Negro children feel inferior to go to segregated schools. Then the question is this: If the going to segregated schools do give Negro children a feeling of inferiority, then is this feeling of inferiority detrimental to these children. The Supreme Court said it was, but offered no proof. But on the other hand—if going to segregated schools do give Negro children a feeling of inferiority—unless this feeling of inferiority is harmful to the well being of Negro children, the Desegregation Decision has no foundation. And in the chapter: THE SCHOOL DESEGREGATION DECISION IS BASELESS, I will prove—by known facts—that the feeling of inferiority is not harmful to a person; but on the other hand, most often, it is the driving force that, seemingly, makes many a person do almost the impossible.

To conquer the world and establish a one-world Communist Government—with a classless society—is the final goal of the Communists. And to reach this goal, the Communists will stop at nothing: they will use every ruse and method of deception that can be imagined—even murder when that will serve their purpose.

And the Communists consider racial tension as their “most powerful weapon” to be used in reaching their goal in these United States. And to make use of this weapon of racial tension, the Communists have infiltrated our every walk of life—our schools, our churches, our labor and all other organizations. This is not a wild assertion, and in the chapter: THE COMMUNISTS AND INTEGRATION, I will

offer convincing proof that will show that the Communists are the real force behind the drive to end racial segregation.

Now, if the issue of racial segregation, is ever to be settled, satisfactorily, to all concerned—both whites and Negroes—then we all—Negroes as well as whites—must understand the meaning of the following terms:

What is liberty? What are the rights of man? How may we know when the rights of one man conflicts with the rights of others? And what do we mean by the term—equal rights?

Therefore, to the end that I may shed some light on the meaning of these things, I now write the first chapter of this book: **THE RIGHTS OF MAN.**

SEGREGATION AND COMMON SENSE

Segregation and Common Sense

CHAPTER I

THE RIGHTS OF MAN

What are the rights of man? What is liberty?

These are age-old questions; they are as old as man himself; and they have never been answered, satisfactorily. And no two questions are as important to all mankind as these. Because, whether or not all persons shall have the right to enjoy all their God given rights, depends upon the interpretation placed upon these two terms.

And in my opinion, nothing has caused more bloodshed, throughout the entire history of the world, than the controversy over what are the rights of man, or what is the meaning of the word, liberty. But in spite of this the conflict goes on, and its solution seems no nearer today than it did a thousand years ago. As time moves on, these unanswered questions keep pace with it, all the while causing strife, grief and sorrow among men.

Many men have long realized that the world is in need of a clarification, as to what are the rights of man, or what is meant by the word, liberty. Abraham Lincoln was one of these men. During the Civil War, on April 18, 1864, at Baltimore, Maryland, in a speech, among other things, he said:

"The world has never had a good definition of the

word liberty, and the American people, just now, are much in want of one. We all declare for liberty; but in using the same word we do not all mean the same thing. With some the word liberty may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself, and the product of his labor; while with others the same word may mean for some men to do as they please with other men, and the product of other men's labor. Here are two, not only different, but incompatible things, called by the same name, liberty. And it follows that each of the things is, by the respective parties, called by two different and incompatible things—liberty and tyranny.

"The shepherd drives the wolf from the sheep's throat, for which the sheep thanks the shepherd as his liberator, while the wolf denounces him for the same act, as the destroyer of liberty, especially as the sheep was a black one. Plainly the sheep and wolf are not agreed upon a definition of the word liberty; and precisely the same difference prevails today among us human creatures, even in the North, and all professing to love liberty. Hence we behold the process by which thousands are daily passing from under the yoke of bondage, hailed by some as the advance of liberty, and bewailed by others as the destruction of liberty."

Here, Lincoln gives us a good example as to how men can differ over the meaning of what is liberty, while at the same time, all proclaiming to be champions of liberty. But right here, Lincoln left us where he started: he never attempted to give the world a good definition of the word, liberty. So, we are right where we were in 1864: "The world has never had a good definition of the word liberty, and the American people, just now, are much in want of one."

Whether or not, the word liberty can be defined so that its interpretation will be satisfactory to all, is doubtful. But there is no reason to believe that it cannot be defined so that when we speak of a man's liberty, we will know what we are talking about.

The issue of racial segregation is the greatest issue that has confronted the American People since the Civil War. This issue, like all other issues, involves the rights of man. But the very nature of the questions that are raised over racial segregation, makes this issue stand out.

The Negro declares that segregation destroys his liberty; and many white people agree with him. But on the other hand, many other white people proclaim to the world that the forced mixing of the races destroys the liberty of the white man. Obviously, one of these opinions is right, and the other is wrong. So, the question must be: which is right and which is wrong.

So, in view of this difference in opinion as to whose liberty is being destroyed, it must be obvious, that if the issue of racial segregation is ever settled, satisfactorily, we must, somehow, come to a decision as to what the word, liberty means. This is the major task that confronts us today. Because unless we know what we mean when we speak of a man's liberty, no one can truthfully say, whether or not racial segregation is right or wrong.

While the Constitution of these United States spells out certain very important rights of the people of this Nation, it fails to give us a rule by which we may determine what are the rights of man—in and under all circumstances.

The Declaration of Independence is a great document; yet it sheds but little light on how we may know

what we mean when we speak of a man's liberty. It merely asserts that all men are entitled to certain rights, when it declares:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Thus it can be seen that the Declaration of Independence speaks of the rights of man, only, in general terms; and because of this, the word—equal and the word—liberty, are the two most abused words in the English Language today. Their interpretation is being construed in a way that will destroy all LIBERTY.

The term: "That all men are created equal," is interpreted by those, who are clamoring for race-mixing, to mean that all men, having been created equal—that because of this equal creation, all races should be integrated in all the various walks of life.

But there is much evidence to prove that Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, never had any such idea in his mind when he wrote: "That all men are created equal." Jefferson first wrote: "That all men are created equal and independent." But later, he drew a line through the words, "and independent." Why Jefferson did this, I do not know; but this I do believe: If these two words had not been struck from the Declaration of Independence, it is more than a possibility that there would be no trouble over racial segregation in this Nation today; and I further believe that if Jefferson had thought that some day an attempt would be made to force the white people of this Nation to associate with Negroes, then he would have let these two words, "and independent" stay in the Declaration of Independence. Because Jefferson's later writings prove, beyond a doubt, that

he believed that the white and Negro races should be forever free and independent of each other.

In the book, "Sketches of the Life, Writings and Opinions of Thomas Jefferson," by B. L. Rayner, published in 1832, by A. Francis and W. Boardman, on page 164, is a statement by Jefferson, which clearly shows what he thought about whites and Negroes living together, in the same country, once the Negroes were free. He said:

"Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government."

Thus spoke Jefferson, plainly and clearly. Therefore, in view of this statement, it cannot be construed that Jefferson's assertion: "That all men are created equal"; and because of this equal creation, all men, regardless of race, or color, should be forced to associate together in all the various walks of life. But on the other hand, this statement does show that Jefferson did believe that the Negro should be as free as the white man; but once free, he believed that the Negro should enjoy all his freedom within the Negro race. If Jefferson had not believed this, he would not have said: "nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government." Nothing can be plainer than this to prove that Jefferson was a strong believer in racial segregation, and in the SEPARATE BUT EQUAL DOCTRINE, long advocated by the South.

Lincoln, like Jefferson, believed that the best solution to the racial problem—once the Negroes were free—was to deport and re-settle them in another country. But this was not done; we still have the Negro with us; and the Supreme Court has declared

that racial segregation is unconstitutional in public schools and other public places. But a court decision—within itself—does not mean that any given decision is right, based on what is right, or what is wrong. If it did, the Dred Scott decision of 1857, would have made the institution of slavery right. Based on the Constitution, this decision could have been right; but based upon the rights of man, this decision was wrong.

Now, the Supreme Court—basing its decision on what the Courts say is the Constitution—declares that racial segregation is wrong in public schools and various other places. But based upon **THE RIGHTS OF MAN—THE RIGHTS OF ALL MEN**, is this decision, which forces white people to associate with Negroes, **RIGHT**, or is it **WRONG**?

Although realizing the immensity of the task, I will attempt to determine—based upon **THE RIGHTS OF MAN—THE RIGHTS OF ALL MEN**, regardless of race, creed, or color—whether racial segregation is **RIGHT**, or is **WRONG**.

I have no quarrel with the statement: "That all men are created equal." Because all this can mean is that all men—being created equally free—all men should have all the rights, in all fields, and to all things—where, only, an individual has a legitimate interest. And the individual can be, either an individual person, or an individual group of persons, such as a city, a county, a state, a nation, a company, a religious or any other organization, or any one of the various races of mankind. Any of these—when taken as a whole is an individual. To understand this, is a starting point to the understanding of the meaning of real Liberty.

Now, I think that we can say—without fear of contradiction—that there can be no rights to others, to things that belong, only, to an individual. Then it

follows: that if you force an individual to give rights to others—to things that belong, only, to that individual, then you destroy the rights of that individual; and it does not matter whether that individual is an individual person, or individual group of persons, such as any one that was named above.

A man's home is individual property; and if you should force the owner of a home to let another man come into his home with equal rights with the owner of that home, then you would destroy the freedom and rights of the owner of that home. And if this was done to all homes, then there would be no homes.

Any business—whether owned by an individual person, or a group of persons, is an individual—an individual business. Force any business to give equal rights to others, who own no interest in that business, then not only the rights of that business would be destroyed, but the business itself. Apply this same rule to all businesses, then no one could own a business.

There are many organizations in the United States, such as fraternal, labor, religious and so on. Each and every organization—no matter what kind it is, is an individual—an individual organization. Force all organizations to give equal rights, within each of their respective organization, to others who are not members, then you would destroy the rights of all organizations. And under such conditions, there could be no organizations of any kind.

There are fifty states in these United States. Each of these states is an individual—an individual state. Force any one of these states to give equal rights—in its internal affairs—to all the other states, then you would destroy the rights of that state. Apply this same rule to all the states, then there would be no sovereign states.

Likewise, there are many nations in the world. Each of these nations is an individual—an individual nation. Force any one of these nations to give equal rights—in its internal affairs—to any other nation, then that nation's rights will be destroyed. Do this to all nations, then there will be no free nations. And I am sorry to say that there are some nations today that have been forced to do this very thing; and in these nations, there is no freedom. This is not theory; this is facts.

So, it boils down to this: Force all individual persons, or all individual groups of persons, to give equal rights to others to things that belong, only to themselves, then you will destroy all freedom. Under these conditions, there could be no freedom of religion; there could be no freedom of speech or of the press; there could be no kind of free enterprise; neither could there be any self government; and there could be no individual states, or individual nations. In fact—under conditions like these—there could be, only, a one-world government, with complete dictatorial power over all persons.

Is this what we want? Well, that is what it means when you force an individual—be it an individual person, or an individual group of persons, such as an organization, a community, a city, a county, a state, or a nation—to give equal rights to others to things that belong, only, to themselves.

We are told that there are five races of men: white, black, brown, yellow and red. Each of these races is an individual—an individual race. And as an individual, each race should be given the same rights—concerning things that belong to it—as is given to any other individual.

The color of the skin and all other racial charac-

teristics of the various races, belong, respectively, to each individual race. Therefore, if you force the white race to let the Negro race to come into the white race with equal rights—the right to freely mix and mingle in schools and other places—then you will destroy the rights of the white race to perpetuate its own race. Because sooner or later, inter-racial marriages will take place; and in the end, there will be no white race—only a mongrel race can be the final result. And this will be—when it happens—just as destructive to individual freedom, as it would be to force a man to let another man come into his home with equal rights. In one case you destroy the rights of a man and a home; and in the other case, you destroy the rights of the white race, and the white race itself. In both cases, you destroy the rights of individuals. In one case, you destroy the rights of an individual person; and in the other case, you destroy the rights of an individual race—one of the races of mankind.

In these United States, all men have the right to own a home and raise a family; but no man has a legitimate right to raise a family, except in his own home.

Likewise, the Negro race should have the right to have, and to enjoy, every right that the white race has; but all the rights of the Negro race should be exercised within the Negro race. And under conditions like these, both races would be equally free. And it is more than reasonable to believe that this is what both Jefferson and Lincoln had in mind when they advocated, that once the Negroes were free, they should be colonized in another country.

If all men are created equal, then it follows that all men having been created equal, all men should be equally free. And if all men are equally free, then all

men should be equally free to protect and defend whatever belong to them, be it a piece of property, such as a man's home, or be it the color of a man's skin. And if the white race—by NATURE'S LAWS—does not have the right to protect the color of its skin, then the white race was not created equal with the Negro race. And the white race does not have the right to protect the color of its own skin, if it is forced to mix and mingle with Negroes. But the white race was created equal with the Negro race; therefore, by NATURE'S LAWS—the LAWS of GOD—the white race does have the right to defend its own self from destruction by being forced to mix with the Negro race. But by the edict of the Supreme Court, the white race does not now have the right to perpetuate its own race; and the Negro race knows this. But this is what the Negro wants. He does not want the white race perpetuated; he wants it mongrelized with the Negro race, and for this reason:

The Negro does not think that he was created equal with the white man, when it concerns the color of his skin. He thinks that his Creator showed partiality toward him, when He made him with a black skin and the white man with a white skin. The truth of this assertion can be found in the fact that a great majority of Negroes do not like their own color. And in the chapter: WHAT DOES THE NEGRO WANT, I will present the evidence that more than proves that most Negroes do not like the color of their own skin. And when any person has something that he does not like, then the natural thing he does, is to get rid of it, if possible. And by attempting to force the white race to associate with him, the Negro is trying to do this very thing—he is trying to get rid of his own color. Because, he knows that if the races

can be forced to associate together—in the end—the races will be amalgamated. And when this amalgamation is completed, the Negro knows that there will be neither a white race, nor a Negro race. Only a mongrel race can be the end result. This will destroy the white man's rights, or liberty—either one you want to call it is correct; but it will not destroy the rights of the Negro, because this is what he wants. The Negro wants equality—equality of skin color; and he does not care for destroying the rights of the white man to get this equality. Yes, equality of skin color is what the Negro wants out of race mixing. And this is the reason that you hear so much about why the Negro should be given equality, and so little about preserving LIBERTY.

The real force behind the drive to force racial integration is none other than the Communists. All others are mere tools in their hands.

In the writings of many of the so-called modern social scientists, you can find much evidence to this effect. Most of these writers are Communists, or belong to a Communist front organization, or have done work for the Communists in some manner.

Among these writers is Gunnar Myrdal. He is a Swedish Socialist, and he is the man who wrote the book, *"An American Dilemma."* And from the pages of this book, the Supreme Court said it depended upon, mostly, for its authority to desegregate the schools of these United States. And no man has ever shown a greater contempt for the Constitution of the United States than Myrdal. On page 12 and 13 of his book mentioned above, Myrdal made this statement:

The Constitution of the United States "is in many respects impractical and ill-suited for modern condi-

tions," and its adoption "was nearly a plot against the common people."

This one statement should be enough to open the eyes of any one who might have any doubt as to the purpose of Myrdal's writings. But if this was not enough, then the next statement by Myrdal should. This assertion will be found on page nine of the same book noted above. Here Myrdal, either scorns LIBERTY itself, or he has no true conception of the meaning of the word, liberty, when in speaking of LIBERTY, Myrdal said:

"It is a vague ideal: Everything turns around whose liberty is preserved, to what extent and in what direction. In society liberty for one may mean the suppression of liberty for others. . . . In America as everywhere else—and sometimes, perhaps, on the average, a little more ruthlessly—liberty often provided an opportunity for the stronger to rob the weaker."

Nothing could be more untrue than this statement. This is true, because LIBERTY is no vague idea. LIBERTY means freedom; and where there is freedom, oppression does not exist.

Then Myrdal continues by stating that in the United States, there is a "conflict between equality and liberty" and that "Equality is slowly winning."

But this statement is also untrue. Because where there is LIBERTY, there can be no conflict between equality and LIBERTY. Where there is LIBERTY, all will have LIBERTY; and all will have equality where equality is due. This I will more fully explain later on.

But Myrdal does not hesitate to say whose LIBERTY must go in favor of equality, when it concerns what he calls discrimination against Negroes. On page

574, of his book mentioned above, Myrdal shows his true colors, when he made this statement.

"When there is substantial discrimination present, liberty for the white person has to be overruled by equality."

Here Myrdal is speaking of discrimination of the Negro race by the white race. And in Myrdal's opinion, there is no greater discrimination against the Negro race than racial segregation. Therefore, Myrdal is saying, in effect: I know that racial integration will destroy the LIBERTY of the white man; but the Liberty of the white man must be sacrificed on the altar of mongrelization, so that the Negro can have equality—equality of the color of the skin—not too far in the distant future.

Now, in view of this, it must be obvious that the Supreme Court must have been brainwashed by the social scientists, such as Myrdal and others; otherwise, the Supreme Court never would have relied upon the writings of Myrdal and other social scientists for its authority to desegregate the schools of these United States. It just does not make sense. Because, Myrdal says—in effect—that with racial integration, the LIBERTY of the white man must go out the door.

Not only has the Supreme Court been brainwashed concerning racial segregation, but many other Americans. In no other way can it be explained why so many are howling and clamoring for integration of the white and Negro races; while at the same time, they must realize that with the races integrated, that some day there will be no white race.

So, in face of all this, something must be done: a great many people of these United States and the world must be un-brainwashed. In some way, the people of this Nation and the world must be made to

understand the real meaning of the word, liberty. Because we are faced with the same situation today as the world was in 1864, when Lincoln said: "The world has never had a good definition of the word liberty, and the American people, just now, are much in want of one."

Never in the whole history of the world has the American people, and the other people of the world needed to have a clarification of the word, liberty than, right now. But time will not wait for this to be done. And I will not attempt to do what no other man has done; but I will endeavor to explain the meaning of the word, liberty, so that we may know what we mean when we speak of a man's liberty.

Liberty is no "vague idea." Only those—like Myrdal—whose only wish is to confuse the minds of men, thereby making them easy prey for the acceptance of the Communist doctrine of a one-world classless society, ever expresses this viewpoint. Because all men—who have a true conception of the meaning of LIBERTY—know that where LIBERTY exists, there is no oppression; and that oppression can exist only under the rule of tyrants.

And where there is LIBERTY, there can be no conflict between equality and LIBERTY. Because where there is LIBERTY, all men will have LIBERTY; but where there is LIBERTY, all men cannot have equality, except in their own sphere. For example—as I have stated before—all men have a legitimate right to own a home, have a wife and raise a family; but no man has the right to go into another man's home and demand equal rights in that home. When all men have a right to own a home, have a wife and raise a family, all men have equal rights in this field. This is the true meaning of equality; and when

used in this sense, there can never be a conflict between equality and LIBERTY.

In the field of education, this same principle holds true. As I have stated previously, the Negro is entitled to every right that the white man has; but these rights should be exercised within the Negro race. And the Negro child is entitled to as good an education as any white man's child; but this education should be obtained in a Negro school; and when this is done, the Negro child will have equality with the white child, in the same sense that all men have equal rights—in the right to raise a family—when all have the right to own a home and have a wife. And when this principle is recognized and adhered to, all men will have LIBERTY; and all men will have equality within their own sphere, such as a man's own home, his own lodge, his own church and so on; and above all, within his own race.

Now, we have been talking about some of the things that are necessary if there is to be LIBERTY for all men; and it must now be evident that LIBERTY does not mean that a man can do as he pleases. If this was the meaning of LIBERTY, only the strong would have LIBERTY; and might would not make right, but might would rule, oppressing the weak and the lame. So, we see—if all men are to have LIBERTY, then all men must be restrained. But how, when and where this restraint is to be applied, is now the question before us. Daniel Webster once said: "Liberty exists in proportion to wholesome restraint." This means much, but still it leaves us in the dark, as to how, when and where this restraint should be applied, so that all will have LIBERTY.

The main reason—I think—why no one has ever come up with a good definition of the word, liberty, is:

LIBERTY has always been thought of as only one of the rights of man. The Declaration of Independence speaks of LIBERTY, as being among man's unalienable rights. But LIBERTY is much more than one of man's rights: LIBERTY is the sum total of all the legitimate rights of man, together with the right to exercise these rights. And when we undertake to define LIBERTY, as one of the rights of man, I am doubtful that it can be done. But if we take a look at LIBERTY, as all the rights of man, then, I think it is possible that we may get somewhere.

That old definition of LIBERTY: that a person may do as he pleases, so long as he does not interfere with the rights of others, is not enough. The weakness here is that it does not provide a rule by which we may judge what are the rights of the other man. A good definition of the word, liberty, must provide us with a rule by which we may judge, not only what are your rights and what are my rights; but it must also, tell how we may know what are the rights of all men. Because only by knowing how to tell where your rights end, and my rights begin, may we be able to know what we mean when we speak of a man's LIBERTY.

It is like this: Only by knowing the landmarks between your neighbor's property and your own, are you able to know when you are not trespassing on your neighbor's property. Likewise, unless there is some clear cut rule by which you may judge where your rights end; and where the rights of your neighbor begin, you may not be able to ascertain—at all times—whether or not, you are interfering with the rights of your neighbor. Your LIBERTY—as well as all others—depends on this. The question then is: How we may judge what are the rights of man—the rights of all men? Answer this question correctly, then you

will be able to tell what is LIBERTY—what is the LIBERTY of all men.

If a man has LIBERTY, he has the right to life; he has the right to the pursuit of happiness; he has the right to ownership, to both tangible and intangible things; he has the right to both freedom of speech and freedom of religion; he has the right to equal opportunities; he has the right to equality before the law; he has the equal right to participate in the choosing of the form of government under which he lives, and the election of the officials of that government; he has a right in all things, both tangible and intangible, in which he has a legitimate interest or share therein; and he has equal rights in all things, both tangible and intangible, in which he has an equal legitimate interest or share therein. The right to all these things is a man's LIBERTY—the LIBERTY of all men. Deny a man the right to these things, then that man does not have LIBERTY.

All the legitimate rights of any man, taken together—with the right to exercise these rights—is that man's LIBERTY. But all men do not have the same rights. Men, only, have legitimate rights where they have a legitimate interest or share in whatever is under consideration. And there is nothing mysterious about this. We all know that a man should have no rights in any thing, where he does not have a legitimate interest or share. This is an important principle; and if we will keep it in mind, then it should not be too difficult to come to an understanding as to what are the legitimate rights of any man, or any group of men—in and under all circumstances.

At the risk of becoming monotonous, in the following pages, I will be using the word, legitimate, quite often. In this work, there is no other word that

will quite take its place. For instance, it is possible for a man or group of men to obtain the legal rights to some particular thing through a legal process of law, by falsifying the facts, concerning that particular thing. Rights obtained in this manner might be legal; but no rights obtained by misrepresenting the facts, could be said to be legitimate, or RIGHT. So, in the sense that it is RIGHT—regardless of the legal aspects—I will be using the word, legitimate.

Also, the manner in which I will be using the word, interest, needs explaining.

A man might be interested in a certain piece of property; But just being interested would not give him any legitimate rights in the property. But if he owned a share in the property, then he would have a legitimate interest in that property; and a legitimate interest gives legitimate rights. In this sense, I will be using the word, interest.

Now, there is one fundamental principle upon which the rights to all rights is based: Before a man can have a legitimate right in anything—it matters not what it is—he must first have a legitimate share or interest in that thing. It must not be a spurious interest; it must be genuine.

There can be no exceptions to this. Because if you give a man a right where he does not have a legitimate interest, then you would be giving him the right to interfere with the rights of others; and this would destroy the LIBERTY of others.

Then it boils down to this: Wherever a man has a legitimate interest or share, he has legitimate rights. But where a man does not have a legitimate interest or share, then he should have no rights. And where a man has all the legitimate interest or shares, in anything, then that man should have all rights in that

thing. But where a man has an equal interest or shares in a thing with others—the number does not matter—then he should have equal rights in that thing.

All this that I have been saying is nothing new, but a few simple illustrations will make it more easy to understand the meaning of LIBERTY.

If a man owns the whole of anything, such as a certain piece of property, then he owns all the interest in that property. So, under these conditions, this man should have all the rights in that property. But if two or more men—the number does not matter—own a piece of property together, all owning an equal share, then all should have equal rights in that property, because they all have an equal legitimate interest.

This principle holds true, whenever or wherever, the rights of man are involved; and it matters not whether it concerns tangible or intangible things. For instance, all men that live under the same government, have an equal interest in that government. The mere fact that they live under the same government, gives them this equal interest. Therefore, all men that live under the same government, should have equal rights in the voice of running that government.

So, on and on it goes: where there is a legitimate interest, there is a legitimate right; and where there is an equal legitimate interest, there should be equal rights; but where there is not a legitimate interest, then there should be no rights. Keep all this in mind, then we can define the word, liberty.

LIBERTY is the right of all persons—regardless of race, creed, or color—to partake of, or to share—in all things, regardless of what it is—whenever, however, or wherever, there is a legitimate interest; and each and every person, or group of persons, partaking

of, or sharing—all according to their respective legitimate interest, therein.

LIBERTY, as here defined, provides a rule by which we may judge what are the rights of any man, or any group of men, such as an individual person, an organization, a business, a company, a city, a county, a state, a nation, or one of the races of mankind—in and under all circumstances. It tells how we may judge where the rights of one man ends, and where the rights of the other man begins: Give all men rights where they have a legitimate interest—all according to their legitimate interest; but give no man any rights, where he does not have a legitimate interest; do this, then all men will have LIBERTY. And under conditions like these, the strong will never oppress the weak; and only under conditions like these can the LIBERTY of all men be secure. And then it follows that only in nations that provide and make it possible for conditions, such as these to exist, do all men have LIBERTY.

LIBERTY, as here defined, is no "vague idea," like Myrdal described it to be. Because, we all know—that if there is to be LIBERTY for all persons—all men must be restrained, otherwise, none except the strong would have LIBERTY. Well—here it is pointed out, when and how much any man must be restrained, so that the other man may have LIBERTY, too. And here, all men are restrained—all according to their respective legitimate interest that they may have in any particular thing.

Down through the ages, the weak have been oppressed by the strong. But never in all history has FREEDOM; while oppression means tyranny. So, means the opposite of oppression: LIBERTY means LIBERTY been responsible for this. Because Liberty

both LIBERTY and oppression cannot exist at the same time, in the same place. Therefore, there can be but one conclusion: where there is oppression, there LIBERTY does not exist.

The right to all things must come from some source. To be legitimate, all rights must come from the source that has the authority to give, grant, or to dispose of legitimately. Because we know that only from the rightful owner can we get a legitimate title, which gives us the legitimate interest; and which in return, gives us our legitimate rights. We know that this is true, because when we buy a piece of property, such as a home, it must be purchased from the one who has a clear title to the property, otherwise, it is impossible to get a clear title.

God is the Creator of all things; and being the Creator of all things, God is the rightful owner of all things; and being the rightful owner of every thing, God is the Supreme authority over every thing.

Therefore, God being the Supreme authority over all, only God has the authority to grant to all mankind the Right to all rights—LIBERTY. And LIBERTY—the RIGHT to all rights—is a gift from God.

The right to life is the one right that God has given to all men. Therefore, it is reasonable to believe that God intended that all men, regardless of skin color, should have an equal right to enjoy life. And to this end, it is necessary that all men, of all races, creeds and colors, should have equal opportunities in all the various walks of life; that they should have equal rights and equal justice under the law; and that they should have equal rights in choosing the form of government under which they live, and a voice in the election of the officials of that government. In all these things, all men have an equal legitimate interest

—these things concern all men alike and in the same manner.

But God did not create all men alike. Taking together, all men that have—generally speaking—the same skin color and other similar bodily characteristics—are called a race—a race of mankind.

Now, it is also reasonable to believe—that God having made all the races different, such as the color of the skin, and other racial traits—that it was God's purpose, from the beginning, for each race to be equally free and independent of each other; and each race being, equally, free, each race should enjoy its freedom within its own race. And may I ask, if this was not God's intention, why did He make the various races, and then place each race in a different part of the world? Man has been the mixer of the races and not God.

The right of ownership is one of man's rights; and without this right, a man does not have LIBERTY. And the Constitution of the United States guarantees the right of ownership; and the laws of God sustains this right. And the right of ownership carries with it the right to use, the right to enjoy, and the right to dispose of as one pleases; and the things that a man rightfully owns, no one else has the right to use, to damage or destroy, either directly or indirectly, for his own personal use, or otherwise.

The white man was born with a white skin and other racial characteristics that distinguish him from all other races. A man's life, together with the body that contains his life, with all its individual racial characteristics, is a gift from God. And God being the sole owner and Supreme authority over everything, a gift from God carries a clear title of sole ownership. Thus it must be obvious that a man is the one and only

owner of his own body, together with all its racial traits. And remember that when a person owns the whole of anything, that gives him all the legitimate interest in that thing; and when a person holds all the legitimate interest in a thing, then he has all the legitimate rights in that thing.

Therefore, being the sole owner of all its own racial characteristics, the white race has all the legitimate rights that may concern, or affect the white race in any manner. And having these rights, all members of the white race—acting as individuals, or as a whole—should have the right to protect their own race from influences that will in the end destroy the race itself. And without this right, the white race does not have **LIBERTY**—the right to protect itself from utter destruction. And I am sorry to say that today, this is a fact—the white race does not have **LIBERTY**. It has lost its right to protect itself from influences that will, sooner or later, cause the white race to vanish from the face of the earth.

The Supreme Court, by the school desegregation decision, on May 17, 1954, dealt the blow that ended the freedom of the white race, in its relations with the Negro race. That decision forces the white race to send its children—while they are young and their minds are in the formative stage—to integrated schools. This forced mingling of the races—while children are young, can lead only to one thing—the mongrelization of the races. But this is what the Negro wants; this is his final goal. And unless the school desegregation is reversed, the white race will be performing—by force—a job the Negro has long wanted done. To fuse his blood with that of the white race—thereby losing his identity as a Negro—has long been the desire of a large majority of the Negro

race. But by himself, the Negro has been unable to reach this goal; so the Negro—with the help of other forces—has persuaded the Supreme Court to force the white race to associate with Negroes in schools and other places. Thus by this forced mingling of the races, making it possible for the Negro to reach his goal of the amalgamation of the races, the white race is being forced to do a job for the Negro race—a job the Negro race cannot do without the help of the white race. So, call it what you may, whenever, however, or wherever, any person or persons are forced to do a job for others, that is slavery. And that is where every member of the white race is, right now—in slavery, doing a service for the Negro. A service that the Negro must have, if his goal of racial mongrelization is reached.

Down through the ages, there has been some race mixing. But in Great Britain, Western and Northwestern Europe, there have never been much race mixing of diverse races. The people of these countries are all closely related by blood; all having come from the same original stock—the Aryan race. And it was from these countries that most of the ancestors of the white race of these United States came from. And because the ancestors of the white race came from countries, where they were proud of their race, and did not mix their blood with other diverse races, we now have a white race in the United States.

But if these ancestors—of the white race—of ours had been forced to mix and mingle with Negroes a thousand years ago, it is more than probable, that today, there would be no white race in the United States.

But the ancestors of the white race of the United States had racial pride. They believed in racial in-

tegrity; and they were proud of their own race. And because these ancestors of ours believed in racial integrity, and had racial pride, the great majority of the people of this Nation are white, and not a mongrel race. But the destiny of the white race was in their hands; it was in their power—whether or not—there would be, right now—in this Land of OURS, a white race or a mongrel race. But they were true to the trust that we—their unborn heirs—would have had the right to expect of them; and because of this, you and I can proudly say: our grandfathers and grandmothers, and our fathers and mothers, were white.

While they lived, our forefathers were the custodians of the white race. They had the right to, either to stay white, or to mix their blood with other races, and by so doing, become a mongrel race. But they were not forced to mix with the Negro, or any other diverse race. And believing in racial integrity, they did not mix their blood; they stayed white; and because they stayed white, we have a white race today.

Now, we the living of the white race, are the custodians of the white race, just now. The destiny of the white race is now in our hands. Will we be faithful to the trust that now rests in our hands—as our forefathers did—and not mix our blood with that of the Negro, so that a thousand years from now, there will be a white race?

There is no doubt in my mind, but that the great majority of the white people of these United States wishes to preserve the integrity of the white race, just as much as our forefathers did. But if the white race is to be able to do what its forebears did, then the white race must have the same rights that our forefathers had—the right not to be forced to mix and mingle with other divergent races, such as the Negro.

Especially, is this true with young children. Force young children to mix and mingle with Negroes in schools and other places, and they will lose their racial pride—that pride that is so necessary, if the races are not to become mongrelized. This is true, because once the white race loses its racial pride, there is nothing that will prevent interracial marriages; and that will mean the end of the white race.

And the foundation has been laid that makes this possible. The Supreme Court has said that our public schools must be integrated; it has said that our children—our small children, must associate with Negroes—must mix and mingle with Negroes, at the time their minds are in the formative stage. At this time, children do not question the right or the wrong, or the good or the bad of a thing. They go to school for one purpose—to learn; and they learn whatever is placed before them, be it good or bad, or right or wrong. So, place them among Negroes while they are young, and the foundation is laid for the development of friendships that will lead to the acceptance of Negroes as life partners in marriage.

So, it must be obvious, that with the forced mixing and mingling of the races in public schools and other places, we of the white race today do not have the same right to keep the integrity of the white that our forefathers had. Our ancestors were free to choose their own associates; but we of the white race do not have that freedom. And may I ask, what is more wrong than forcing the white race to associate with the Negro race? And may I answer it by saying that nothing can be more wrong. Because in all nature, birds and animals practice segregation; and only man has forced their mixing. Are men no better than animals?

For more than a hundred years, the Communists have been preaching the doctrine of a One-World Classless Society, dominated and controlled by the Communists.

Now, for such a society as this to exist over all the world, there can be but one class of human beings, all over the world. And for such as this to be, all men must be placed on the same level, in all fields in all the various walks of life. In other words, if there is ever to be a classless society—world wide—all men must, somehow, become the same in all fields—the same as two black eyed peas in the same pod; otherwise there can never be a classless society. And in the field of economics, we know that the only way that this can be done is to take away from those who have more and give it to those who have less, until all are on the same level, economically. But if all the races of mankind are to become the same, the blood of all races must be fused and blended together; otherwise, this is impossible; and without all mankind becoming the same, as to racial characteristics, a classless society is an impossibility. Because in a classless society, all things must be the same.

Now the Communists know that there are fundamental differences in the various races of mankind. And they know that so long as the white race believe that there is a fundamental difference in the races, then just so long will the white race fight for its racial integrity. So there was work to be done. Somehow, the white race must be made to believe that there were no fundamental differences between the races. To do this, the minds of men must be changed in their belief and attitude toward race. To this end, the importance of race had to be minimized—minimized to the extent, so that all racial pride would be lost. This was a

must, because they knew that as long as men had racial pride, they would fight for the right to keep their respective races pure. And to accomplish this purpose, as well as other aspects of their program for world conquest, the Communists laid the plans more than a hundred years ago. And in a speech by Karl Marx, at the meeting of the First (Communist) International, at Amsterdam, Holland, in 1872, revealed where the Communists should exert their greatest efforts, in their drive for world conquest, especially in the United States, when Marx declared:

"But we do not assert that the way to reach this goal is the same everywhere. We know that the institutions, the manners and the customs of the various countries must be considered, and we do not deny that there are countries like England and America . . . where the worker may obtain his object by peaceful means. But not in all countries is this the case."

Here in a few words, Marx told the Communists the things that they must do, so as to soften up the people of the United States and the world, thereby making them easy prey for the acceptance of the Communist doctrine of a classless one-world government, controlled and dominated by the Communists.

In substance, Marx said to the Communists: By some means or the other, we must get into the many and various institutions, throughout the world—the various institutions of learning, of religion, and all other institutions, regardless of their nature. And in effect, Marx continued: When you get into those institutions, go to work and do whatever is necessary to change the customs and manners, of all people, of all nations, as to their ideals concerning their government, their religion, their LIBERTY and their race—be-

cause all this must be done, if there is to be a classless one-world government, and we its master.

We know that this was the meaning of Marx's words, because that is just what the Communists have done in these United States. We know that they have infiltrated into all institutions of every walk of life in this Nation—our colleges, our universities, our religious institutions, the labor and fraternal, and all other organizations, of whatever nature.

In order that the white people of these United States would lose their racial pride and become indifferent as to preserving their racial integrity, the Communists have devised many schemes.

One of these schemes is what is known as the racial equalitarian doctrine—the doctrine that there is no fundamental difference in the various races of mankind. And what minor differences there are, were brought about by environmental influences; or in other words, by the process of evolution. And all those—as far as I have been able to ascertain—who believe in this racial equalitarian doctrine—believe that natural causes were the factors that brought all the several races into being, instead of being separately created by a Divine Power. And because of this, it can be certain that none of those—who are preaching this racial equalitarian doctrine—are working for the best interest of their Creator—God.

The "Daddy" of this racial equalitarian doctrine, in these United States—in my opinion, and I do not think that I will be contradicted—was Franz Boas, an anthropologist. Boas came to the United States from Germany in 1886; and for many years, he was a professor at Columbia University. And his racial equalitarian philosophy has had a most profound effect upon the minds of many people, concerning "Race"—what

is race? not only here in the United States, but throughout the entire world. Some idea of how vast this influence has been, may be gained from a statement by Myrdal. Myrdal—as you will remember—is the man who has the greatest contempt for the Constitution of the United States, and who thinks that Liberty is a “vague idea”; and whose writings the Supreme Court relied on, mostly, for its authority for its School Desegregation Decision.

On page 96 in his book, *“An American Dilemma,”* Myrdal makes this statement: “It is now becoming difficult for even popular writers to express other views than the ones of racial equalitarianism and still retain intellectual respect.”

Now, for three quarters of a century, Boas's racial equalitarian doctrine has been taught in the many institutions of learning of this Nation to our young people, as scientific facts. And in our higher institutions of learning, such as the colleges and universities, and even the theological seminaries, much emphasis has been placed on the teaching of this racial philosophy. So, in view of this, there is no wonder that so many of the better educated people of these United States are clamoring for the end to racial segregation. Because we are mostly what we have been taught. Burn all the books; then teach that the world is flat; and in a few generations, that is what the world will believe.

But in spite of the acceptance by so many of the so-called intellectuals, Boas's theories are not scientific facts; but instead of being scientific facts, they are worthless—they mean nothing. And there is much proof to back up this assertion; and in another chapter, I will give some of this proof. But this is not

necessary, because Boas's own words prove that his racial philosophy is without foundation.

Boas spent a lifetime teaching the doctrine of racial equalitarianism. But when he came to die, Boas was not sure—was not sure that all those long years he had been teaching the right thing. Why? Because, just as he was dying, Boas said, "I have a new theory about race. . . ." Margaret Mead, the author of the book, *"An Anthropologist at Work,"* tells of Boas's death, on page 355 of that book as follows:

"On December 29, 1942, Boas was given a lunch for his old friend Paul Rivet at the faculty club at Columbia University. A glass of wine in his hand, he said, 'I have a new theory about race. . . .' and fell back dead."

What was this new theory? No one knows, because Boas died before he had time to explain its nature. But the very fact that Boas had a new theory at all about race, proves that he himself did not believe—up to the time of his death—that his theories were scientific facts. Because when a person has proven—beyond a doubt—that a thing is a fact, then he does not try to prove that it is something else. For instance, after Benjamin Franklin had proven that lightning was electricity, he never again tried to prove that it was something else.

But in spite of these facts, this racial equalitarian doctrine of Boas continues to be taught in our schools, as scientific facts. And our young people are still accepting them as scientific facts, and will as long as they are taught as such.

So, in view of these facts, there is no wonder that we are faced with a racial problem today. And there is no wonder that the so-called intellectuals of this Nation—in all walks of life—are raving and howling

for the mixing of the races. And if there is such a thing as mass brainwashing, then it has been done, right here in these United States.

But the Negro does not go all the way with this racial equalitarian doctrine. And while the social scientist raves over the color of the skin of the various races, as being only a minor difference, and of little importance, the Negro proves—by his own attitude toward the color of his own skin—that he thinks that the black color of his skin, makes a great difference between the Negro and white race. There is much proof to support this assertion. And the so-called social scientists are well aware of this fact.

During the past few decades, there have been much investigating and writing, concerning the Negro and his problems. I have read quite a few books written by these investigators. And all those that I have read, agree on one thing:

That within the Negro race, there is no social equality between dark skin and light skin Negroes; and even in homes, where there are children, some with dark skin and some with light skin, there is conflict and discrimination. Concerning this conflict and discrimination—within the Negro race, on account of color, Charles S. Johnson, on page 267, in his book, *Growing Up in the Black Belt*," says this:

"The social values associated with color have extremely serious consequences for Negro youth. Conflict situations may develop between families and arise within families. It often happens that darker children in families feel that their parents give preference to the children of lighter complexion. . . . Children may apply color values unfavorably to one or the other of the parents, or find themselves apologizing for the dark complexion of a parent. They may even

harbor resentment against the parent who was biologically responsible for their own undesirable appearance."

Edward B. Reuter, in his book, "*The American Race Problem*," makes this statement:

"Within the race, as between the races, color is a physical fact that automatically classifies."

Donald Young, in his work, "*American Minority People*," says this:

"Dark Negroes themselves look up to and envy their lighter brothers, although they may hate them for their accidental advantage of complexion."

Many more similar quotations from other writers could be given, but at this time, these should be enough to show that the Negro puts a very high value on a white skin—the color of the white man. And from this, it must be obvious that the Negro thinks that there is a vast difference between the Negro and white race. In other words, the Negro thinks that the color difference of the races—within itself—makes the difference—a great difference.

And with all this conflict and discrimination within the Negro race—all because some Negroes are of a lighter color than others, is it not more than reasonable to believe that the Negro will never be satisfied with anything short of the complete fusion of the blood of the Negro race with that of the white race. This is true, because only by the fusion of the blood of both races, can there be a sameness in color of what was once the white and Negro races. And only when this happens and all people become the same color, will this conflict and discrimination, because of color differences end. This is true—not because the white race discriminates against the Negro race because of the Negro's color; but it is true, because the Negro

does not like being a Negro—he wants to be a white man. But this being impossible, the Negro will never be satisfied, until the whole Negro race becomes as white as possible, by fusing the blood of the Negro and white race together. In the chapter: **WHAT THE NEGRO WANTS**, I will discuss this more fully.

But in spite of this obvious reason why Negroes want to force white people to associate with them, the so-called social scientists are using every means that can be thought of that would cause white people to associate with Negroes, in all places and under all circumstances. To this end, some are saying that there are no such thing as races; that the term, races is a “myth”; and in fact, there is only one race—the human race.

Those who are preaching this one-race doctrine know what they are doing. They know that once this one-race doctrine takes roots and grows, then the members of the white race will become apathetic as to the meaning of their own race; and once this becomes a fact, the “PATH” that leads to the mongrelization of the races will be wide open, with no stop signs.

Let us examine some of the arguments of one of the most out-spoken of these one-race advocates. In his book, *“Man’s Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race,”* Ashley Montagu, an anthropologist, makes these startling statements:

“The idea of ‘race’ represents one of the greatest errors, if not the greatest error, of our time, and the most tragic. . . . Certainly it is true that many scientists have attempted to classify and fit the varieties of mankind into definite groups, the so-called ‘races,’ but

all such attempts have thus far met with complete failure."

Nothing could be more absurd than this statement; but if the white race can be made to believe it, in due time, it will be true—there will be but one race.

In their effort to prove that the Negro got his black skin by natural processes, Montagu and others argue that the black skin of the Negro is an "adaptive protection against the actinic rays of the sun" which Montagu says are "dangerous." But concerning this, let us listen to Montagu himself when he declares:

"Black skin appears to represent a character of an adaptive value which in some groups followed upon the loss of the body-covering of hair. Thus, most apes and monkeys which possess an abundant hairy coat have white skin beneath the hair. . . .

"It should be obvious that black and white skins are, in their own ways, characters of physiological importance for the survival of the individual. In hot climates those individuals would be most favored who possessed skins sufficiently dark to cut off the dangerous actinic rays of the sun. In cool climates, where the rays of the sun are not so intense and the body requires a certain amount of sunlight in order to function properly, those individuals would be at an advantage—that is to say, over a considerable period of time—who were characterized by a lesser amount of pigment in the skin."

Now, may I ask why was nature so unkind to the Negro, so that it took off his hairy covering and left his naked body exposed to those so-called "dangerous" actinic rays of the sun; and while at the same time and under the same climatic conditions, the hairy coverings of the apes and monkeys were left on?

Surely environmental influences were not the cause

of this strange phenomenon. Because the native homes of monkeys, apes and Negroes, were all in a hot climate. If this were environmental influences at work, then it is strange to me that it will work one way on monkeys and apes; and then under the same conditions, reverse its action on the Negro. It just does not make sense.

The facts are that Montagu's theories concerning the origin of the black skin of the Negro has no foundation. Because the white man has been able to live in any part of the world, from the hottest to the coldest, without being harmed by the so-called "dangerous" actinic rays of the sun. And the pages of history show that the white man has lived in some of the hottest lands of the world, for thousands of years, without ever becoming a Negro. Mesopotamia has one of the hottest climates that can be found anywhere; yet, in that land, the white man developed one of the greatest civilizations of the ancient world.

The fact of the matter is that when the origin of the color of the Negro's skin is attempted to be explained by natural causes, then you are in deep water and no way to escape. For proof of this statement, I will turn to Charles Darwin. Darwin was not the first man to teach the theory of evolution; but he was the first man, who taught it in such a way—that in the end, by making so many people believe in it—that the belief in this theory, in time, may change the whole course of human events. But Darwin, when faced with the hard cold facts, which were open to all the world, openly proclaimed to the world that climatic factors were not responsible for producing the different skin colors in the various races. In his book, "The Descent of Man," Darwin tells the story like this:

"Of all the differences between the races of man, the color of the skin is the most conspicuous and one of the best marked. It was formerly thought that the differences of this kind could be accounted for by long exposure to different climates; but Pallas first showed that this is not tenable, and he has since been followed by about all anthropologists. This view has been rejected chiefly because the distribution of the variously coloured races, most of whom have long inhabited their present homes, does not coincide with corresponding differences of climate. Some little weight may be given to such cases as that of the Dutch families, who, as we hear on excellent authority, have not undergone the least change of colour after residing for three centuries in South Africa. An argument on the same side may likewise be drawn from the uniform appearance in various parts of the world of Gypsies and Jews. . . .

"The Esquimaux live exclusively on animal food; they are clothed in thick fur, and are exposed to intense cold and prolonged darkness; yet they do not differ in any extreme degree from the inhabitants of Southern China, who live entirely on vegetable food, and are exposed almost naked to a hot, glaring climate. The unclothed Fuegians live on the marine productions of their inhospitable shores; the Botocudos wander about the hot forest of the interior and live chiefly on vegetable productions; yet these tribes resemble each other so closely that the Fuegians on board the *Beagle* were mistaken by some Brazilians for Botocudos. The Botocudos again, as well as the other inhabitants of tropical America, are wholly different from the Negroes who inhabit the opposite shores of the Atlantic, are exposed to a nearly similar climate, and follow nearly the same habits of life."

Thus Darwin explodes the theory that the color of the skin of the various races of mankind was brought about by environmental influences, such as climate, diet, kind of clothing, or to other factors due to climatic conditions.

In one case, Darwin found people that did not differ greatly from each other; yet, one group, the Eskimos, lived in the far North; and the other group, the inhabitants of South China, lived in a very hot climate. But in another case, Darwin found that the Botocudo Indians and other inhabitants of tropical America, were "wholly different" from the Negroes of Africa on the opposite side of the Atlantic, that were exposed to a climate that was "nearly similar"; and whose habits of life were "nearly the same."

Then, Darwin goes on to state: "Some little weight may be given to such cases as that of the Dutch families, who, as we hear on excellent authority, have not undergone the least change of colour after residing for three centuries in South Africa. An argument on the same side may likewise be drawn from the uniform appearance in various parts of the world of Gypsies and Jews . . ."

Gypsies and Jews are scattered over the world, in hot, temperate and cold climates; but wherever they are found, they look like gypsies and Jews—long exposure to all kinds of climatic conditions have not changed their physical characteristics.

To have any foundation, the theory that climatic conditions are responsible for the color of the skin of the various races, we should find these things: In all similar climates, we should find similar color of skin; all people who have lived in hot climates for long periods of time, should be of the same color; and all people who have lived in temperate or cold climates,

should be white—the colder the climate, the whiter they should be; and the hotter the climate, the blacker they should be. But we do not find things like this.

At the dawn of historical times, we found the Negro in Africa. As a whole, Africa has a very hot climate; but the Southern end of Africa is in the temperate zone; but no white man was found there. Also, in Southern Asia, another hot place, the Negro was found. Later on the Negro was found in Australia and other islands. But there were other places with tropical climates that had no Negroes. Why not?

From Northern Africa to Northern Europe, the white man was found. Also, in Southwest Asia, the white man made his home. Mesopotamia, one of the hottest places on earth, was the home of the white man, who built the greatest civilization of ancient times. But no Negroes were found here. Why not?

From Southern China, which is very hot, to the arctic region, which is very cold, is the home of the yellow race. No white race developed in any part of this region, hot or cold. Why not?

But now, we come to the most mysterious land of all; that is, if climate is the maker of the various races of mankind. From the arctic region of North America to the Southern end of South America, no Negro or white man ever made his home, until 1492 when Columbus discovered America. Before this, only the Eskimos, who dwelt in the arctic regions of North America, and the Indians, who roamed the remainder of this vast land, were known to have made their homes in this great land.

Now, in view of the claim made by some anthropologists and others that the different races of man were brought about by different climatic conditions, such as a hot climate produced the Negro; and a

temperate or cold climate produced the white race, why did a white race not develop in the Americas where there is so much land that has a temperate or cold climate? And why was there not a Negro race in tropical South America, which has a climate that is so similar to that of tropical Africa?

If climate has been the producer of the races of mankind, then all natives of Northern Asia should have been white; all Eskimos and Indians of North America should have been white; all natives of Central and tropical South America should have been Negroes; and the natives of the Southern end of South America should have been white.

Therefore, the theory that climate is the maker of the various races, just does not make sense. A theory based on a supposition that gives different results under similar conditions is worthless. So, it follows that the theory that the color of the skin of the different races is due to different climatic conditions has no foundation.

But in spite of this, the so-called social scientists continue to teach—as scientific facts—in the schools of these United States, that the different races of mankind came into being by natural causes, such as climatic conditions. And all this is producing a most profound effect upon the people of this Nation. It is causing the people of all races to become apathetic toward their own race—making them so indifferent, as to the real meaning of what is meant by “RACE,” until they are accepting and doing the very things that will in the end destroy all races. By doing this, they are giving up one of their most sacred rights—the right to perpetuate their own race.

Another scheme that is being used to confuse the people of the white race, so that they will become un-

concerned and complacent in regard to racial purity, is that of race-mixing itself. When this subject is raised, you will hear statements, something like this: "What are you talking about? The races are already mixed; you are many hundreds of years late to begin talking about racial purity. So, why worry about a little more mixing?"

It is true that there has been race-mixing all down through the ages. No one can deny this. But it is also true that we still have a white race, a Negro race, a yellow race, a brown race and a red race.

And there is another thing that is true; and this is obvious to all: There has never been a law made by man, or proclaimed by God that has not been broken by man.

The laws of God and the laws of these United States forbid murder. And the punishment for murder in this Nation is either death or life in prison; but in spite of the extreme punishment, men continue to kill each other. And just as there have been some race-mixing ever since the different races came in contact with each other, likewise, men have been committing murder ever since Cain slew Abel.

All men do not commit murder; but some men do. But nobody recommends repealing all laws against murder, just because some men kill their neighbor. Because to do so, would legalize murder, and no person's life would be safe. To repeal laws against murder, is no way to safeguard lives.

Likewise, there have been some race-mixing, since time immemorial; but just because there have been some race-mixing, is no valid reason why all laws against race-mixing be outlawed, because, surely, the repealing of all segregation laws, will not promote racial purity; but instead, it will make it impossible

for the white race, or any other race to protect itself from complete destruction. In principle, there is no difference in repealing all laws against murder, thereby placing all persons' lives in peril, than there is in repealing all laws against racial segregation, thereby placing in peril the perpetuity of all races. Surely all races have this right, based on the laws of nature—the laws of God. And because of this, the laws of all people should proclaim racial freedom—the freedom that gives to all races the right to freely perpetuate their own respective race.

Race-mixing is contrary to the laws of God—the Creator of all things. There is much proof of this assertion to be found in the Scriptures; but one of the strongest proofs is not to be found in what God said, but in what He did.

It is an old saying: "Actions speak louder than words." And so it is with God and racial segregation: what He did about separating the different races, speaks louder than what He said about it. We know that this is true, because at the beginning of historical time, all races were segregated, each in a different part of the world. Thus God was the first segregationist.

If you should visit a farmer, who had a number of different breeds of cattle; and if each of these breeds were separated from each other by good strong fences, would it be necessary for this farmer to put big signs all over his farm, stating that he did not want his different breeds of cattle mixed with each other? Of course not. The mere fact that the cattle were separated from each other by good strong fences would be sufficient proof to show to the world that this farmer wanted his cattle separated from each other.

Likewise, the mere fact that God separated the dif-

ferent races from each other, should be more than ample proof that God intended that the races be kept separated from each other for all time. So, if the laws of man make race-mixing—at the same time—these man made laws invalidate the laws of God.

If all the laws in every nation throughout the world were repealed against murder, chaos, terror and much killing would be the results. But terrible as it would be, all mankind would not be killed.

But repeal all segregation laws and force the intermingling of all races throughout the world; and sooner, or later, the results will be the amalgamation of all races into one. Then, all the races that now exist, will be no more—in a sense they will be dead.

Of all the schemes to lull the men and women of the white race into complacency, the one that inter-racial marriages will not result in an inferior mongrel race, is the most absurd. But because this covers so much ground, I will not discuss it here. In the chapter: **THE RISE AND FALL OF NATIONS**, I will tell the whole story concerning the crossing of the various races.

Still another scheme that is being used to pull the wool over the eyes of the white race, is the one that proclaims that inter-racial marriage is a personal matter—a matter that concerns only the marriage partners. That if a Negro and a white person wish to marry each other, then that is nobody's business, except their own. But this is shallow thinking at its worst. Because when a white person marries a Negro, it becomes much more than a personal matter—it is a matter that concerns the whole white race.

Earlier, we learned that a person had a right where he had a legitimate interest; but we also learned that how much right a person had in a particular thing,

depended upon how much legitimate interest he had in that thing. If he held all the legitimate interest, then he had all rights in that thing. But if others—the number does not matter—had an equal legitimate interest with him in that thing, then all who had this interest, would have an equal legitimate right to protect that thing from destruction. So, in a case like this—whatever anyone, who had a legitimate right in that thing, did to that thing—would concern everyone who had a legitimate right in that thing. Let us put it this way:

Every person in these United States has a legitimate interest in the welfare of this Nation; and because of this legitimate interest in the Nation's welfare, every person has a legitimate right to see that the Nation is protected from within and from without from those who would destroy it. And whatever any person might do to jeopardize the welfare of the Nation, would concern every person in the Nation. Therefore, no one will dare say that it would be just a personal matter for some person to turn over secret information to another nation, if this would lead to the destruction of this Nation.

Likewise, every white person is a member of the white race; and every white person, being a member of the white race, has an equal legitimate interest—in everything that concerns the white race as a whole. And this equal legitimate interest, gives every person of the white race an equal right to everything that concerns the white race as a whole. So, whatever any member of the white race might do that would lead, or might lead to its own destruction, concerns every person of the white race. Therefore, in view of this, how can anyone say: inter-racial marriages are just

personal matters? Because inter-racial marriages will destroy all races, sooner or later.

When a child is young, it is innocent and unlearned. At this time of life, a child has an open mind; and it is eager to grasp whatever in the way of knowledge that is thrown its way. But being unlearned, a child has no way of knowing, whether or not, what it is taught in school, or elsewhere, is good or bad for it, or for future generations. So, it is obvious, that most often, a child accepts as truths and facts whatever it is taught. And because of this, nothing but truths and facts should be taught a child. Therefore, because of this, a child should never be taught theories. Theories should never be taught to children until they are mature enough and have gained enough knowledge to reason for themselves. To attempt to teach a theory to a child before it is old enough and has gained enough knowledge to reason for itself, is not teaching that child; but on the other hand, it is indoctrinating that child.

The doctrine of racial equalitarianism is not a proven fact; and the forces, that are preaching this racial philosophy, know that mature men, with reasoning power, will not accept it—unless they were indoctrinated with it while they were young. These forces are well aware of the Biblical axiom: "Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old he will not depart from it." But they don't intend to "train up" the young people of this Nation "in the way they should go"; but the so-called social scientists intend to "train up" the young children in the way that they want them to go.

For many years, this racial equalitarian doctrine has been taught to young people in colleges and universities: but now it is being proposed—and it is being

done in some places—that this racial philosophy be taught in the lower grades to the very young. And the best way that I know for you to see that this is true is to let some of these so-called social scientists speak for themselves. Otto Klineberg, a social psychologist, in his book, *"Race Differences,"* has this to say:

"There is no need to pass laws against miscegenation. The human race is one, biologically. There are no subvarieties whose genes are mutually incompatible, or whose crossing will necessarily lead to degeneration. Race mixture is not in itself harmful if the parents' stocks are healthy. . . . Once science has demonstrated that there is nothing in the brain or blood of other races which justifies our ill-treatment of them, it becomes important to see that this knowledge is disseminated. In this respect, the schools have a particularly important function to perform. If attitudes are to be changed in the face of the forces tending to perpetuate them, the only hope is to reach them early, and to give to children habits of favorable reactions to other races which will stay with them through life."

Another so-called social scientist, Ashley Montagu, an anthropologist, in his work, *"The Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race,"* states it this way:

"It is through the lower and upper grade schools that the most significant work can be done in clarifying the minds of individuals concerning the facts relating to the varieties of man and in educating them in the proper mental attitudes. . . . Our children must be taught that a certain form of nose or a certain skin color is in the physical scales of values neither better nor worse than any other. . . ."

Thus speak two so-called social scientists. But throughout this Land of ours, there are many more

like them, who believe that the only way that the great masses of people can be made to accept this racial equalitarian doctrine, is to get to them while they are young—while they are so young that they are not capable to reason things out for themselves.

But this does not mean that a person cannot be misled after he is old enough to reason things out for himself. Because, before a person is capable of reasoning a thing out to a logical conclusion, he must be as well informed on one side, as he is the other; otherwise, his reasoning cannot be sound, and his conclusions will be in line with the side on which he was the better informed. And by taking advantage of this, the forces—who are crying from the hill top, the by-ways and the house tops, for racial integration—have been able to indoctrinate many young people in our colleges, universities and our religious institutions, with this racial equalitarian doctrine. This is why so many of what is known as the better educated people, including preachers, are the most ardent supporters of this racial equalitarian philosophy.

But all people do not go to college. But most children do go to lower grade schools. This is why these so-called social scientists believe that if the great majority of the American people are ever to be made to accept this racial equalitarian doctrine, then it must be taught them while they are in grade schools.

Most grown-ups of these United States are rational people. And if they are as well informed on both sides of most any subject, they are capable of reaching a sound conclusion. This is a well known fact that is recognized by all people. Therefore, in view of this—if this racial equalitarian doctrine is a scientific fact, and the grownup people of these United States are presented with the cold hard facts—are they not capa-

ble of reaching a sound conclusion as to the facts in the case?

There can be but one answer to this question: If there are no fundamental differences between the various races of mankind, and the facts of this, are placed squarely before the mature people of these United States—then we must say that they would be capable of arriving at the right conclusion—a just verdict to all concerned. And if this be true—and it is true—why do the so-called social scientists say: "If attitudes are to be changed in the face of the forces tending to perpetuate them, the only hope is to reach them early, and to give to children habits of favorable reactions to other races which will stay with them through life."

In other words, what is said here is this: We know that we do not have the proof to prove that there are no fundamental differences between the various races of mankind; and we know, that the great majority of mature men and women—being capable of reasoning for themselves—will never accept the theory that there are no fundamental differences between the races; therefore, the only way this un-proven doctrine of racial equalitarianism would ever be accepted by the vast majority of all people, would be to teach it to un-learned children, who were not old enough to reason for themselves.

Now, in view of this, we can come to only one conclusion: When men have no way to get the masses of people to accept a theory, or a doctrine, except to reach them, while they are young, un-learned and before being old enough to reason for themselves, then that theory or doctrine can be nothing but an un-sound theory or doctrine. So, in view of this, we must conclude: the theory of racial equalitarianism is unsound and is without a foundation.

Now, before going further, I want to get one thing straight: The doctrine of racial equalitarianism is a theory that there are no fundamental differences between the various races of mankind. It has nothing to do with—one way or the other—whether the races are equal or not equal. Things can be equal; yet, they can be different. For instance, one farmer may have a herd of black cattle; and another farmer may have a herd of white faced Herefords; and these different herds of cattle can be equal in economic value; yet, no man, who knows cattle, would say that there was no fundamental difference between these herds of cattle. Because, whatever it is that is necessary to make a thing what it is, that is a fundamental thing. So, in the case of these two herds of cattle, the color of each herd—if nothing else—makes each herd what it is; so, this difference in color, must be a fundamental difference between these herds of cattle.

Likewise, because the Negro is black and the white man is white, does not mean that they are not equal to each other, or that one is superior to the other. But this difference in color does mean that there is a fundamental difference between the races. Because—whatever it is that makes a thing what it is, that thing is a fundamental thing; and one thing that makes a Negro what he is—if nothing else—is the color of his skin; and the one thing that makes a white man what he is—if nothing else—is his white skin; therefore, in view of this, there must be a fundamental difference between the Negro and white race.

Klineberg, a social psychologist says: "The human race is one, biologically speaking."

To the extent that all races are capable of mixing their blood, we must agree. But because it is possible for all races to mix their blood, this does not mean

that it is Right—RIGHT according to the RIGHTS OF MAN, or RIGHT in the SIGHT of God. And in the chapter: THE RISE AND FALL OF NATIONS, I will show that a mixture of diverse races is not to the best interest and well being of all mankind; and in the chapter: GOD AND SEGREGATION, I will show that race-mixing is not RIGHT in the SIGHT of God.

Self preservation is the first law of nature. So, in view of this, how can racial segregation be wrong and discriminatory against the Negro? Does not a man have a right to build a fence to prevent his white cattle from mixing with his neighbor's black cattle? If he does—and you know he does—then segregation is RIGHT and not WRONG. Because racial segregation is only a fence—a social fence; and this social fence is the only effective barrier that the white man has erected to prevent the white race from mixing its blood with that of the Negro race. And is not the perpetuation of the white race of more importance than the perpetuation of a certain breed of cattle? If it is—and it must be—then we can say that the Right of the white race, or any other race, to separate or to segregate itself from all other races, is a God Given-RIGHT.

Now, in view of all of this—in view of all things concerning the RIGHTS OF MAN—it must be obvious that segregation does not destroy any RIGHTS, that belong to the Negro. But on the other hand, racial segregation is based upon one of the soundest principles known to man: the principle that there can be no RIGHTS to others, to things that belong, only to an individual, or only concern an individual. This is true, because without adherence to this principle, there can be no individual

LIBERTY of any kind: no individual homes, no individual businesses of any kind, no individual organizations, no individual counties, no individual states, no individual nations, and so on; and without adherence to this principle, there can be no individual races of mankind—not for long. But if this one principle is adhered to, there will be **LIBERTY** for all, regardless of race, creed or color, and oppression for none.

CHAPTER II

THE RISE AND FALL OF NATIONS

History and Anthropology, the science of man, have been a lifetime hobby of mine. I have studied both extensively, because to know history, you must know man; and to know man you must know history. And because of my lifelong occupation, a farmer, the study of plant and animal breeding became a necessity. Because of this, much of what I have to say on this subject, has been gained from experience.

Why have so many nations, down through the ages, built great civilizations, flourish for a time, then without any apparent reason, wither away and perish; or to be conquered by some weaker and less cultured nation? This question has never been answered satisfactorily. But one thing stands out: no great civilization—no matter whether it was a large or small nation—has ever perished within itself; or has been conquered by a smaller or weaker nation without first, its people became apathetic and complacent; or in other words, they lost that "go-get-em" spirit which is so necessary if any people are to accomplish anything worthwhile.

Then the question arises: what have been the factors that have caused the people of so many great civilizations to become apathetic and complacent that caused them to fall from greatness?

China built one of the great civilizations of ancient times. And unlike the other great civilizations of the times, it did not wither away and perish; it lived on for

thousands of years, almost, without change; while, at the same time, other civilizations—some greater than that of China—withered away and died. Why, may we ask, did the civilization of China endure for thousands of years, yet others as great, or greater soon passed away?

The Jews are another people who built a civilization thousands of years ago. Their nation was conquered before the birth of Christ. They were driven from their native land, and are now dispersed over the whole face of the earth; yet the civilization that the Jews built did not perish from the earth—it lived on, even until today. Why?

The answer to these questions can be summed up in a few words like this: Race mixing or crossing on the one hand; and relatively speaking, no race mixing or crossing on the other hand.

For a good many years it has been known that the mating of unrelated animals is likely to produce offspring with more vigor than the parental stock. This phenomenon is called heterosis, or hybrid vigor.

This knowledge is being put to good use by the farmers of this Nation right now. In the production of meat animals, crossbreeding is being used extensively. Crossbred animals often show more vigor, better feed conversion, and increased growth.

In the poultry industry, most all poultry grown in this country at this time, for both meat and eggs, are the offspring of crossbreeds. The meat type chicken from crossbreeds has more vigor, better and faster growth with more efficient feed conversion; and the egg type chicken from cross breed parents, has more vigor, lays more eggs, lays over a longer period of time without molting, and its feed conversion, based on number of eggs laid is much better.

Other crossbred farm animals produce results similar to these. So, all this crossbreeding of farm animals adds up to more dollars in the pocket of the farmers. These are facts; they cannot be denied.

But the farmer is not stopping here. He is using his knowledge of that hybrid vigor to grow better crops of higher yields of most all farm crops today. By far, the greater part of the corn grown in this Nation now is grown from hybrid seed. Then there can be no denying of the fact that the crossbreeding of both farm animals and plants is beneficial, not only to the farmer, but to all mankind.

But this is not the whole story concerning the crossbreeding of animals and plants. If it was, I would stop right here and concede that race mixing or crossing was good for all mankind. But we cannot stop here; we must go on and tell the whole story. When the whole story is told, I am fully convinced that you will agree with me that the mixing and crossing of the various races of mankind in the manner that would be necessary so that the offspring of these crosses would continue to have hybrid vigor like the offspring of crossbred animals and plants, is an impossibility.

Generally speaking, a hybrid is the offspring of unrelated parents, either of animals or plants. To be most profitable, it is necessary for both parents to be pure bred. To breed one crossbred animal to another crossbred animal can result only in a mongrel herd with the loss of hybrid vigor. But right here, we will let an authority speak on this subject. In their work, "Breeding and Improvement of Farm Animals," Victor Arthur Rice, Professor of Animal Husbandry, at the University of Massachusetts, and Frederick Newcomb Andrews, Professor of Animal Husbandry, at

Purdue University, make this statement in regard to the crossbreeding of hogs:

"Crossbreeding can be continued as a steady policy only by going to pure bred for the boars needed for replacement. Crossbred animals have a lower value as transmitters of inheritance. Crossbred sows may be used successfully for breeding if the boar is a pure bred. In this way the hybrid vigor of the crossbred dam in nursing and rearing pigs may express itself enough to more than compensate for the lower value as a transmitter of inheritance. No such offset for his lowered transmitting value could exist in the case of a crossbred boar. Planless and unsystematic crossing may quickly result in a mongrel herd from which the owner will get neither profit nor pride of ownership."

Professor C. C. Palmer of the National School of Animal Breeding, Pleasant Hill, Ohio, has this to say in general, concerning the crossbreeding of animals:

"The success of crossbreeding depends largely upon the excellence of the breeding stock which is utilized. After the system is under way there is a tendency to lower the high standards of excellence in the pure bred stock which is being crossed and if this is indulged in, the quality and usefulness of the cross bred animals will suffer. For the continuation of the system of crossing it is necessary to maintain two lines of breeding, one to supply the pure bred foundation stock for crossing and the other to supply the cross bred animals themselves."

Thus you see that you cannot breed cross bred animals to cross bred animals, without your herd becoming inferior and unprofitable. Pure bred animals mated to pure bred animals, most often produce offspring that is superior to the parental stock; but cross bred ani-

mals mated to cross bred animals, always produce offspring that is inferior to the parental stock, resulting in a herd of scrubby mongrels.

This same principle holds true in the crossbreeding of plants. Plants grown from hybrid seed have more vigor with an increase in yield of a better quality, most times; but on the other hand, plants grown from hybrid seed of the second generation is inferior to the parental stock and produces a lower yield. For instance, if a farmer grows hybrid corn, it is necessary to buy seed every year, as the second generation of hybrid corn usually drops from 10 to 25 per cent in yield.

It is not possible to crossbreed just any and every kind of animals, and then expect to get that hybrid vigor that is so necessary to give quicker and better growth with a more efficient feed conversion. You must have good purebred animals to cross, if you are to expect the offspring to be superior to the parental stock. But some times, even, with good purebred stock, the offspring is not better than the parental stock. When this happens, they say that the cross did not "nick"; and when the offspring is superior, it is said that the cross "nicked." The only way that a cross can be known to "nick" or not to "nick" is by trial. In support of this statement, I turn again to professors Victor Arthur Rice and Frederick Newcomb Andrews, with their own words as follows:

"The growing realization of the need for good purebred sires for use in crossbreeding is both a challenge to the breeder and an assurance that his creations will be in high demand and at a good price. It will be most unfortunate for all concerned if crossbreeding comes to be considered a panacea for commercial meat production and the idea adopted that

mating anybody's son of some breed with everybody's daughter of some other breed, or grade, would always give desirable results. Actually the value of crossbreeding lies in the genetic merit of the stocks crossed and whether the genetic complexes complement each other. We will not get any more out of a cross than we put in it . . ."

Thus it should be readily seen that crossbreeding is not magic—it is far more than just waving the magician's wand. To be successful, it must be controlled on a scientific basis. To crossbreed, indiscriminately, can only result in an inferior mongrel herd.

For the accuracy of these statements of mine, in addition to the authorities that I have given, I refer the reader to any reliable plant or animal geneticist.

In view of these facts, I say without any reservations, that it is impossible to mix or cross any of the diverse races of mankind, without developing an inferior mongrel race. This is so, because you cannot control the crossbreeding of human beings, like you can plants and animals. To control the crossbreeding of human beings, would mean that the offspring of a cross of two diverse races could never marry and raise families; and in order to keep the crossing or crossbreeding program going, in some way, or some how, you would have to continue to get purebreds of the races being crossed from somewhere. If you did not have a pool of each race being crossed to draw from, sooner or later, you would run out of purebreds to cross. When this happened, you would have two alternatives: You could let the crossbreeds die out and become extinct, or you could let the offspring of the crossbreeds marry and raise families, thereby producing an inferior mongrel race.

But a control program for the crossbreeding of man-

kind is unthinkable. But also, it is foolish, and unthinkable to believe that the diverse races of mankind can be crossed without producing races that are inferior to the parental stock.

But the "equalitarian one-race" social scientists would have us to believe otherwise—they would have us believe the crossing of diverse races will not produce an inferior race. But their statements concerning race crossing are so contradictory until they have no value. Most often they do not tell the whole story about crossbreeding of plants and animals; and when the whole story is told, they hedge with assertions that some of the principles that apply to hybridization of plants and animals do not apply to mankind. For instance, they acknowledge that the offspring of the first generation, of plants, animals and man are likely to have more vigor and vitality than the parent stock of each; but what they will not acknowledge is that in man, the vigor and vitality due to crossing diverse races of man, will not decline after the first generation. But this does not make sense. If part of the principle concerning the crossbreeding of plants and animals does apply to man, then there is no logical reason why the whole does not apply.

So, in spite of the scientific evidence to the contrary, our "equalitarian one-race" social scientists are broadcasting the message to the world that race crossing of the diverse races of man is beneficial to all mankind. On page 102 of his work, *"Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race"*, Montagu writes:

"There can be little doubt that those who deliver themselves of unfavorable judgments concerning "race-crossing" are merely expressing their prejudices. For within the framework which encloses the half-caste we are dealing with a conspicuous example of the ac-

tion of socially depressing factors, not with the effects of biological ones. The truth seems to be that far from being deleterious to the resulting offspring and the generations following them, interbreeding between different ethnic groups is from the biological standpoint highly advantageous to mankind."

Then on page 105, Montagu glorifies the advantages of hybrid vigor, resulting from the crossbreeding of plants and animals, as he continues:

"Utilizing the knowledge of hybrid vigor, animal geneticists have succeeded in producing offspring that for particular desired characters are in every way superior to the parental stock, while plant geneticists have succeeded, by the same means, in producing enormous increases in sugar cane, corn, fruits, vegetables and other economically important foodstuffs. Such hybrids are not inferior to their parents, but exhibit qualities far superior to those possessed by either of the parental stocks . . ."

Here Montagu does not tell the whole story. He does not tell that it is not wise to breed from the offspring of crossbred animals; because after the first generation, the hybrid vigor so noticeable in the first generation decreases in succeeding generations. Neither does he tell you that it is not wise to plant the second and succeeding generation seed of crossbred plants that results in decrease yields.

But on page 106, Montagu admits that it is possible that there will be a decline in vigor, after the first generation of the offspring of a cross of the different races of mankind. Let Montagu speak for himself, when he declares:

"All ethnic groups of mankind belong to the same species, and all are mutually fertile, as are the resulting offspring of mating between the members of such

groups. The evidence, though by no means conclusive, suggests that among human beings, as among other forms of life, hybrid vigor is most markedly characteristic of the first generation of hybrids. In the succeeding generations there would appear to be a gradual decline in vigor . . ."

But on page 130, Montagu contradicts this statement by saying:

"True hybrids are, of course, only the first filial generation of crosses; but since all human hybrids are polyhybrids—that is hybrid for a very large number of genes—hybridization in mixed human populations will often extend over a period of many generations."

This last statement contradicts the one before it and it has no foundation. For instance, the offspring from a cross between a Negro and a white person could not be polyhybrid—it could be nothing but a plain first generation hybrid, resulting from a cross between a Negro and a white person; and there is no scientific evidence that the hybrid vigor—if there was any—resulting from such a cross would extend into many future generations. Based on the same assumption, we could say that all animal hybrid are polyhybrids; and because of this, the hybrid vigor of all crossbreeds would extend into many future generations. But facts do not bear this out. Facts, as we have shown, concerning the crossbreeding of both plants and animals, show that hybrid vigor, resulting from crossbreeding, declines after the first generation.

There has been no experimental work on the crossbreeding of the different races of mankind, as there has been in the breeding of plants and animals; so, the only thing that we have to go on—based on scientific facts—is the experimental work done with plants

and animals. I have searched far and wide and I have been unable to find anything that would lead to the conclusion that the hybrid vigor, resulting from the crossbreeding of plants and animals, carries beyond the first generation. Therefore, I say without reservation, that the assertion that the hybrid vigor, resulting from crossing of diverse races of mankind, is baseless—it has no foundation whatever. But on the other hand, we have much historical evidence that proves without a doubt, that the crossing of diverse races of mankind has been detrimental to mankind. This, I will produce a little later in this chapter. But before we get to that, let us listen to the man, who, in my opinion, is the “Daddy” of all this “equalitarian one-race” doctrine. This man is Franz Boas whom I have already mentioned. But Boas—like so many others—fails to prove that race crossing is not deleterious to mankind. On page six of his work, *“Race, Language and Culture,”* Boas admits that much that we know concerning the heredity in man has been learned from the knowledge gained from the experimental work that has been done with plants and animals, when he states:

“The actual occurrence of intermingling leads us to consider what the biological effect of intermixture of different types may be. Much light has been shed on this question through the intensive study of the phenomena of heredity. It is true we are hampered in the study of heredity in man by the impossibility of experimentation, but much can be learned from observation and through the application of studies of heredity in animals and plants.”

But apparently, Boas never learned anything from the vast amount of experimental work that has been done concerning the breeding of both plants and ani-

mals; because, if he had, surely, his attitude toward race crossing in man would have been quite different. Because, as I have stated previously, it is a recognized scientific fact, that to crossbreed plants and animals, indiscriminately, can result in nothing but a mongrel herd in animals that is inferior to the parental stock; and in plants, a much reduced yield.

In the face of the known facts concerning crossbreeding of both plants and animals, it is hard to understand how a statement can be made like the one found on page 13 of Boas's work, *"Race, Language and Culture,"* when he says:

"I believe the present state of our knowledge justifies us in saying that, while individuals differ, biological differences between races are small. There is no reason to believe that one race is by nature so much more intelligent, endowed with great will power, or emotionally more stable than another, that the difference would materially influence its culture. Nor is there any good reason to believe that the differences between races are so great that the descendants of mixed marriages would be inferior to their parents. Biologically there is no good reason to object to fairly close inbreeding in healthy groups, nor to intermingling of the principal races."

We have a number of breeds of cattle. Biologically speaking, there can be no great difference between them. All belong to the same species and are mutually fertile. But crossbreed them, indiscriminately and you produce inferior stock. This is where Boas failed to learn from scientific facts.

So far, I have been presenting scientific evidence, gained from experimental work with animals and plants, to show what is liable to happen if the different races of mankind are crossed. So now, I will present

historical facts—facts that will show the evil effects of race crossing down through the ages. When these facts are made clear, it should be obvious why nations have risen, built great civilizations, flourished for a time, then wither away and perish.

The first evidence that I wish to present is from the man that I have just been quoting—Franz Boas. I have stated previously, that apparently, Boas never learned anything from the facts gained from the experimental work that has been done with plants and animals on crossbreeding. In addition to this, I now say that it seems that Boas never learned anything from observing historical facts on this same subject. Because, if he had, and at the same time, had kept in his mind the scientific facts that had been gained from plant and animal experimentation, he never would have made the statement that I am about to quote. But he made it and you will find it on page five of his work that we have been quoting from. Now listen while Boas condemns himself, when he declares:

“Although it is not necessary to consider the great differences in type that occur in a population as due to mixture of different types, it is easy to see that intermingling has played an important part in the history of modern populations. Let us recall to our minds the migrations that occurred in early times in Europe, when the Kelts of Western Europe swept over Italy and Eastward to Asia Minor; when the Teutonic tribes migrated from the Black Sea westward into Italy, Spain and even into North Africa; when the Slav expanded northeastward over Russia, and southward into the Balkan Peninsula; when the Moors held a large part of Spain, when the Roman and Greek slaves disappeared in the general population, and when Roman colonization affected a large part of the

Mediterranean area. It is interesting to note that Spain's greatness followed the period of greatest race mixture, that its decline set in when the population became stable and immigration stopped."

Thus the man has spoken—the man who is considered one of the greatest, if not the greatest authority on the science of man; the man who proclaimed to the world, that environment and not race has been the chief factor in the building of civilizations; the man whose "equalitarian one-race" doctrine has been accepted by our colleges, universities and religious institutions, as scientific facts—this is the man, without realizing what he was doing, gave us all the proof that is needed to explain the rise and fall of nations. Also, this is the man whose last words on this earth were: "I have a new theory about race . . ." Probably, at last Boas realized that he had been mistaken all the time. Who knows?

In one paragraph, Boas explained the why, or the cause for the decline and fall of the great civilizations that have risen and fell down through the ages. Without realizing what he was doing, Boas did an extra good job—no one could have done better. He was trying to convey the idea that because Spain's greatness followed the period of greatest race mixture, then surely, the mixing of the different races, must be beneficial to mankind.

But Boas had forgotten what had been taught for many years concerning the crossbreeding of plants and animals. He had forgotten that the most vigor and vitality, resulting from crossbreeding, showed up in the offspring of the first cross, or first generation; and he seems, also to have forgotten, that after the first generation, if crossbred animals were bred to

each other, it would result in a mongrel herd of inferior animals.

If the same principles found in crossbreeding plants and animals applies to human beings, then it is possible that race mixing played an important role in producing the greatness of Spain. But it should be remembered, that if race mixing was an important factor in Spain's greatness—then based on the same principle—the decline and fall of Spain from greatness, was due to the continued, indiscriminate, mixing of the first cross-breeds. That is the final outcome of all indiscriminate crossbreeding.

That is the way it happened in Spain. The various races mingled and mixed indiscriminately. Then after a time, there were no more races of pure blood. All races became amalgamated into one mongrel race; and if we have learned anything from the vast amount of experimental work with both plants and animals, then that mongrel race could be nothing but inferior to the races that were mixed to form that mongrel race.

People are what make a nation. No nation is any stronger than its people. A nation with a people who are vigorous, full of vim, vitality and enthusiasm, is a strong nation. Such a nation is almost invincible, except by a much larger nation with like stamina. But when any nation, for any reason, loses qualities like these, then that nation becomes a weak nation, thereby becoming easy prey to other nations that have vigor and enthusiasm. Spain became such a nation before she lost her greatness.

Scientific facts gained from work done with both plants and animal breeding, prove conclusively, that to crossbreed animals, indiscriminately, results in an inferior herd; and in plants, the results are the same.

But in the mixing, or crossing of the different races

of mankind, the mixing or crossing is always done, indiscriminately. This is true, because it is impossible to control the mixing of human beings like you can in the breeding of animals. Therefore, the logical conclusion that can be arrived at concerning the mixing or crossing of the diverse races of man, is that it cannot be anything except detrimental to all mankind.

The pages of history prove that this is true, not only in Spain, but in many other nations. Not only do the pages of history show that race mixing was detrimental in ancient times; but the pages of current history show that the same thing is true now. This can be seen, right now, by any one who will just open their eyes and take a look at the various nations of the world. This I will make clear later; but right now, let us go back to ancient times and take a look around.

There are many things about the ancient world that we do not know and never will know. But there is one thing that we know that stands out: Many, many times, down through the ages, civilized nations have been overcome and subdued by a people or a nation that was less civilized and with a smaller force than the conquered nation. As a rule, great civilized nations are not conquered by smaller nations that are less civilized. But powerful civilized nations, after mixing their blood with different races, have been overcome and conquered by barbarians that were less powerful. But of course, there have been many small nations that have been subjugated and destroyed by larger and more powerful nations, just by mere brute strength. But right here, I want to make one thing clear:

When I speak of a different or diverse race, I mean

a race, such as the black race, the yellow race, the white race, the Semitic or Aryan race; and not just a branch of one of these races, such as the Celts, the Angles, the Saxons, the Franks or the Teutons—all these being merely branches of the Aryan race.

In ancient times, there was a land known as Mesopotamia or Babylonia. This land lay between two rivers, the Tigris and the Euphrates, in Southwestern Asia. Between these rivers was a fertile plain that was arid, but with irrigation, it was very productive. On the West of these rivers was Arabia, the home of a great race—the Semitic; and on the East and North, was the home of another great race—the Aryan. Each of these races alone, was capable and did produce great civilizations; but once the blood of these two races was mixed, it seems like that they become the destroyers of civilizations.

Never in all history has there been more race mixing than in ancient Mesopotamia; and never in all history has so many civilizations been destroyed than in this land.

The first people to occupy this land are known as Sumerians. To what race they belonged is uncertain. Most historians say their origin is unknown; but L. A. Waddell, with much, seemingly, reliable proof of recent date, claims that they were of the Aryan race. But this does not matter, because all authorities agree that they were of the white race but not of the Semitic race. But this we do know: They built one of the great civilizations of ancient times; that it was flourishing 4000 years B.C.; and that it continued to flourish for many centuries afterwards. But at last things began to happen. About the year 2800 B.C., the Sumerians were subdued by a Semitic people with a leader by the name of Sargon. These people were far

less civilized than the Sumerians, but the two races mixed their blood. Then for almost 3000 years after this, Mesopotamia was invaded and conquered time after time. It was a continued process of conquering and race mixing with the conquered, then being conquered in return by a fresh unmixed people. Sometimes, the conqueror was the Semitic people from the West; then again, it was a people of the Aryan race from the East or Northeast. But remember, in all these cases, it was an unmixed people that was less civilized that was subduing and conquering a people of mixed blood. There was no exception to this until Alexander the Great brought all the Persian Empire under his control. Could all this be just a coincidence?

Next we go to Greece. When the people of the Aryan race entered Greece, they found a people that were highly civilized, especially was this true off shore on the island of Crete. These people and the Aryan invaders mingled and mixed their blood. This mixture of people built the civilization of Greece—the greatest civilization of ancient times—and in many respects, the greatest of all times.

So, here again, as in Spain, we are confronted with an actual case where the facts seem to indicate that race mixing is beneficial to mankind. Here we see Greece with an insignificant army withstanding all the onslaughts of a mighty Persian army. Next, we witness Alexander the Great conquering the mighty Persian Empire. Surely, this looks like race mixing can be nothing but beneficial to mankind. But hold on, this is not the whole story.

For many centuries, after the first Aryans entered Greece, many of these same people continued to come into Greece from time to time, thereby bringing in new blood of the same Aryan race. But after Greece

became a great nation, much foreign blood of many races was brought in—all being mixed to form another one of those mongrel races that can be nothing but an inferior race. After this took place, the people of Greece lost their vigor, their energy, their vitality and enthusiasm. All this resulting in a people that were apathetic and complacent. So, when the legions of Rome appeared, they had no will to fight—they fell easy prey to the Romans.

The story of Rome, in most respects, is similar to the story of Greece. One difference is that when the Indo-Europeans invaded Italy, there was not a highly developed civilization as found in Greece. Another difference is that historians have given us a more complete detailed information in regard to the decline and fall of Rome. Otherwise the story is the same. The people of Rome were full of energy and enthusiasm; they had that spirit that gets things done; and they built one of the great civilizations of all times. From a tiny nation, Rome grew into a mighty empire—the greatest the world had ever known up to that time. Rome was supreme.

But Rome, like many other nations, mingled her blood with that of many different races. Her people lost that "go-get-em" spirit; they no longer had that energy of their forefathers; they became complacent; they refused to fight for their country, forcing the nation to hire foreigners to defend their native soil. All this made Rome an easy prey to the barbarians of the North. Once invincible, Rome was conquered by an army of about 15,000 barbarians.

The story of Spain, I have already told. The story of all these nations—from Mesopotamia in the East to Spain in the West—is the same: The decline and fall of each of these nations took place following the

period of greatest race mixture. Only after race mixing, did these nations become weak. Scientific evidence proves that race mixing can be the major factor in producing a nation of weaklings; and the pages of history proves that this is a fact.

This does not tell the whole story of race mixing. So far, we have been studying the results of race mixing; but before we proceed with this, let us pause and study the results of little or no race mixing.

China is the only nation that built a great civilization in ancient times that has endured down through the ages, almost unchanged until recently. While other ancient civilizations, such as Egypt, Babylonia, Persia, Greece and Rome have completely vanished from the scene, China lives on. There must be a reason. There is a reason—a logical reason.

Yes, China had her trouble. Time after time, she was invaded from the North by barbarians—the Huns. She built a great wall 1500 miles long to protect her Northern frontiers, but this was not entirely successful. The Huns kept coming, but they were never able to completely subjugate the Chinese. But the people of China, as a whole, never lost their enthusiasm for the love of their country; they never lost that vim and vigor that is so necessary if a nation is to live on; and because of this, they never became complacent like the Greeks, the Romans and other people that mixed their blood with other races. Thus it can be said that the survival of the civilization of China is due to the non-mongrelization of the whole people of China. But after all, the evil effects of race mixing has left its marks on China.

As a result of the invasions of the barbarians in the North, some race mixing took place. So, because of this, there are two distinct types of people in China

—one in the North, the other in the South. Mary A. Nourse, a historian, describes these different people in her work, *"A Short History of the Chinese,"* like this:

"The Chinese people, like the country, can be divided into two main divisions: northern and southern—two distinct types. The northerner is tall and broad-shouldered, slow of speech and slow to anger; the southerner, short, slender and agile, excitable and fiery of temper."

From this description, it can readily be seen that the people of the North do not have the vigor, the vim and energy as the people of the South. They are a complacent people, lacking in that "never-die" spirit that is so necessary to sustain a great civilization. If the whole population had been like these people, the civilization of China would have perished long, long ago.

Boas and others argue that it is environment that makes the difference—that the hot climate of Africa is responsible for the backwardness of the Negro race today. But facts do not substantiate this. Because we find one of the greatest civilizations of ancient times was produced in one of the hottest places on earth—Mesopotamia. This was the first great civilization produced by the white race. Then we find that this civilization vanished from the earth when its people mixed their blood with other races. Then we find other civilizations rose to take its place, in all cases the conquerors being of un-mixed blood.

Then after thousands of years of this conquering and being conquered, the civilizations of the white race began to move West from Southwestern Asia—the cradle of the white race's civilization.

Beginning with the Persians, a branch of the Aryan race, all the great civilizations of Europe have been

made by different branches of the Aryan race. As these people pushed Westward, they conquered, they built great civilizations; they flourished for a time; they mixed their blood with other diverse races, then those civilizations perished.

This Westward movement continued until there was no place farther West to go. So, other branches of un-mixed Aryan people began to build civilizations in Northwestern Europe. As a whole, these people have never mixed their blood with other diverse races, as those of Southwestern Asia and Southern Europe did. It is true that the people of Northwestern Europe are composed of various branches of the Aryan race, such as the Celts, the Saxons, the Angles, the Franks and the Teutons. These have all mixed with each other. But they are all of the same race; and no civilization made by a mixture of any of the various branches of the Aryan race, has ever decayed. But on the other hand, we find that all the great civilizations that were made by the Aryan race in Southwestern Asia and Southern Europe decayed and perished—they all mixed their blood with different races and not branches of the same race.

So, today, we find the most progressive people of the white race, not in Southwestern Asia, not in Southern Europe, but in Northwestern Europe, England, the United States, Canada and other places where the people are of the un-mixed Aryan race.

Although there is no evidence to prove that the mixture of any or all of the various branches of the Aryan race, with each other, has ever been detrimental to any civilization, there is plenty of evidence to prove that the mixing of certain branches of the white race together, is harmful to the well being of mankind. As pointed out previously, the Semitic race—a branch of

the white race—is a great race; and the Aryan race—another member of the white race, is another great race; but the cold facts are: no great civilization has ever endured where the major population was a mixture of these two races.

In China, we have the same problem, except it is between different branches of the yellow race. In China, the mixing took place in the North. So, it is in the North that we find the most un-progressive people of China. On the other hand, in South China, where the climate is hot, we find the most progressive people of China. This is the region that produces the leaders of China.

Here in China, on the one hand, we have the most progressiveness in the South, where there was little or no race mixing, while in Europe, on the other hand, we find the most progressive nations in the North, where there has been the least race mixing in Europe. In both cases, the most progressive people are found where there have been the least race mixing; and not just where the climate happens to be the hottest. How can Boas and his followers account for this?

Yes, there is a difference—maybe, not too much in races—but when different races are mixed, there is a great difference. A difference so great that the destiny of all mankind can be changed by it.

The Jews are a unique people. As far as numbers go, they are insignificant. They never have been a numerous people. Neither have they ever built a great empire. No people have ever been persecuted more; and no people have ever been driven from their native home, scattered over all the face of the earth—then after all this, retain their identity.

But in spite of all this, they built a civilization that

is unique—it has no equal. Never have a people, so small in numbers, accomplished so much.

The civilization of the Jews was built around one thing: the belief in one Supreme God. From this civilization, man has received the greatest literature ever produced—the Bible. This Bible taught the Jews the evil effects of race mixing. Although there have been some mixing with other races, on the whole, the Jews have followed the teachings of the Bible concerning race mixing. Persecutions and being banished from their native land have not deterred the Jews from keeping their racial integrity.

In unity, there is strength. Though persecuted wherever he has gone, nevertheless, the Jew has prospered. He has prospered to the extent, until long, long ago, he became master of the financial world. This in itself is a great accomplishment. No other people have done so much. Without the unity of the Jewish race, it would have been impossible for the Jews; and if they had mixed their blood with other races, there could have been no unity. Thus it can be seen that the Jews have done much concerning material things by retaining their racial identity; but in comparison with other things, this is very little.

Stop and ponder, just one moment please—try to imagine in your own mind what the consequences would have been, had the Jews mixed their blood with that of the Egyptians during their long stay in Egypt. If the Jews had mixed their blood with that of the Egyptians, that would have ended the Jewish race—there would be no Jewish race today. Besides this, the whole course of human history would have been changed. There would have been no Moses to have led the children of Israel out of Egypt; there would have been no Moses to have received the Ten Com-

mandments from God; there would have been none of the prophets of the Old Testament; there would have been no Joseph and Mary, unto whom Christ was born; and there would not be a Bible like the one that we have now. What we would have for a Bible, I cannot say; but I do say that it would be impossible to have the Bible that we have today. Why? Just because, all these things came by the way of the Jews—the Jews were the instruments in the hands of God that brought these things to pass. But we could not have gotten these things from the Jews, if there were no Jews; and there would have been no Jews, if they had mixed their blood with that of the Egyptians.

Thus we can see that the whole course of human events could have been changed, just by the simple act of the Jews mixing with the Egyptians. Then the question arises: would the destiny of mankind have been served better, if the Jewish race had become extinct in that remote period of history by race mixing? If not, is it not reasonable to believe that mankind can be served today and in the future, better, by all racial types remaining what they are now?

But the Jewish people held steadfast—they did not mix their blood; so, the civilization that the Jews built lives on, thus proving that a race that keeps its racial purity is worth much. Yes, the civilization that the Jews built is unique; but without racial purity, it would never have been.

So far, we have been studying the effects of race mixing in Europe, Asia and part of Africa; but now, let us consider what race mixing is doing in the Americas.

As I have stated previously, the people of the United States and Canada are a mixture of the various branches of the Aryan race. This is true as a whole,

though there are other minor elements. But South of the Rio Grande, we find a different picture. From Mexico on Southward to the Southern end of South America, we find a mixture of many diverse races. In most of the countries, it is Spanish, Indians and Negroes. But in Brazil, it is Portuguese, Indians and Negroes. Then remember that the Portuguese and Spaniards were both a mixed people before they came to the New World. In none of the countries South of the Rio Grande, has there ever been a color line. So, we have the same picture in the Americas that we have in Europe.

In Southern Europe, we found the most race mixing of diverse races; and in Southern Europe, we found the least progressive nations. In Northwestern Europe, where there is the least race mixing of diverse races, we find the most progressive nations of Europe.

Likewise, in the Americas, we find the most race mixing of diverse races South of the Rio Grande; and South of the Rio Grande, we find the least progressive nations of the Americas. North of the Rio Grande, we find the United States and Canada, where there is the least race mixing of diverse races in all the Americas. Here we find the two most progressive nations in all the Americas.

No nation, in all history, in such a short period of time, has ever built a greater civilization than the United States. There is no comparison between the United States, in any field of progress, with any nation South of the Rio Grande. Why? Most of these countries were settled long before the United States, therefore it cannot be because they have not had as long a period to develop their resources. So, we must look elsewhere for the answer. In the face of all the evidence that we have gone over, there cannot be but

one logical answer—race mixing. But we have some of that evidence right in South America.

Argentina and Uruguay have populations that are made up of more people of the white race, and have the least racial mixture of diverse races than any other countries South of the Rio Grande; and in these two countries, there is more progressiveness than in the other countries South of the Rio Grande.

In our studies, we have found that no great civilization has ever decayed and perished within itself; or was conquered by a smaller and weaker nation, without first, its people becoming mixed with various other diverse races. Then we find today that the most progressive nations are made up of people of the least racial mixture. Then I have been unable to find a single nation that was much mixed with diverse races, but what was a backward nation.

With all this staring us in the face, there can be but one answer to the question: Why great civilizations have risen, flourished for a time, then wither and fade away within themselves; or be subdued by a much weaker and less civilized nation? While I would not attempt to deny that there may have been other contributing factors that played a part in the fall of great nations, the major factor can be none other than just one thing—race mixing with diverse races.

But in spite of the vast amount of evidence in support of this assertion, there has been much done in an effort to disprove this statement. One medium that has been used to accomplish this, is the so-called intelligence tests. Boas, Klineberg and others have made much use of this in their endeavor to prove that racial mixing is not detrimental to mankind. These tests have covered whites, Negroes, half breeds and others. But the value of these tests is worthless; because they

do not cover enough ground, and they do not extend over a long enough period of time. There can be nothing learned from testing the offspring of the first generation of plants or animals of crossbreeds. Remember, that it is in the first generation—if there is any—that hybrid vigor shows up. Many farmers, to their sorrow, have bred the offspring of their crossbred animals, because of the fine showing of the offspring of the first generation.

But history gives us a record extending over a long period of time that proves, without a doubt, that the mixing of diverse races of man has resulted in producing mongrel races that were inferior to the races from which they sprang.

Again, Boas proves our point, without intending, or realizing that he was doing it. The ancient civilizations of Southern Europe were made by people of the Aryan race; they mixed their blood with other diverse races and passed away. The civilizations of Northern and Northwestern Europe were made by the same race—the Aryan race. As a whole, the people of Northern and Northwestern Europe, are still of the Aryan race. Not one civilization in this part of Europe has ever decayed and passed away. Let Boas, in his own words, in his work, *Race, Language and Culture*," on page 11, tell the story, when he declares:

"I refer to the many comparative tests of the intelligence of individuals of various European types and of Europeans and Negroes. North Europeans tested in our country were found as a whole decidedly superior to South Europeans, Europeans as a whole to Negroes."

Thus Boas tells us that there is a difference between Northern and Southern Europeans. History tells us what made this difference.

Klineberg gives us a similar picture. On page 153, of his work, "*Race Differences*," he says this:

"Among European immigrant groups, Italians have in general made a poor showing. In a series of studies their I.Q.'s ranged from 76 to 100, with an average about 87. Poles do equally poorly and in the Army tests were even slightly below the Italians. Immigrants from northwestern Europe have in general been more successful, and the demonstration by the Army psychologists that in the test results the immigrants from Great Britain, Holland, Germany and the Scandinavian countries were superior to others has been corroborated by more recent studies."

Thus Klineberg confirms Boas' assertion that there is a difference in the mental capacity between Northern and Southern European.

But before we conclude this chapter, let us take a look at Brazil. Brazil in size is larger than continental United States. But other than in size, there is no comparison between the two countries. Brazil, like China, is more progressive in its Southern part. Brazil, also like China, has had the least race mixing in the Southern part. I will let Lawrence F. Hill tell this story. On page 231, of his recent history of Brazil, called "*Brazil*," he has this to say:

"The center of economic activity is in the South, including the states immediately north and south of the Tropic of Capricorn; Sao Paulo, Minas Gerais, Rio de Janeiro, Espirito Santo, and the Federal District. Although these states comprise only one-sixth of the land area of Brazil, they include more than half of its population. The white man predominates in the region as a whole. Before 1939 these states were the source of 85 per cent of Brazilian agricultural production and 88 per cent of the manufactured output.

They had 74 per cent of the railways, 67 per cent of the roads, 90 per cent of the electric power, and 89 per cent of the factories. Only water transportation connects this region and the dry, sparsely populated, and backward northeast . . .

"The northern region embraces the coastal parts of the states of Maranhao and Piaui, and the states of Ceara, Rio Grande Do Norte, Paraiba, Pernambuco, Alagoas, Sergipe, and Baia. In Sergipe, Baia, and Espirito Santo the population is darker in color than farther south and remnants of the colonial economy persist. The northern region has languished since the abolition of slavery and is retarded agriculturally and industrially. In 1938 the total value of its production was estimated at \$196,000,000, an average of less than 52 cents an acre, or about \$12.63 per inhabitant."

Such are the conditions in Brazil—a nation larger than continental United States, and settled 100 years earlier: In the Southern portion, where the white man predominates, there you find the most progressive and prosperous people of the nation; but on the other hand, in the Northern portion—where the mixed-bloods predominate—you find a backward and unprogressive people.

These conditions in Brazil are not exceptions; such conditions are world wide. Wherever a pure blood race predominates—with one exception—regardless of race, there you find a more progressive people, as compared with a mixture of that race with a diverse race. The one exception to this are the pure blood Negroes in their native land. As we all know, the Negro race has made but little progress, except where he has come in contact with the white man; and we well know that the mulattoes of the United States have made more progress than the pure blood Negroes

of Africa and elsewhere. But this does not prove that a people that are a mixture of the white and Negro races are superior to the white race. But on the other hand, known facts prove—as in the case of Brazil and other nations—that a people, who are a mixture of white and Negro blood, as a whole, are inferior to a people with relatively pure white blood. This, I challenge the world to prove otherwise.

But do not be misled by propaganda. To mislead you, you will be told that many new and superior varieties of plants and breeds of animals have been produced by crossbreeding. Well—these are facts; I will not attempt to deny them; this is not necessary. But the ones who will try to mislead you will not tell you the whole story. Because of this, I will briefly do so.

While it is true that many new and superior varieties of plants and breeds of animals have been developed by crossbreeding, all this has been done under a controlled breeding program—such as crossing the better strains of plants or animals of any of the many species; then selecting the best of such a cross for breeders for the next generation; and then continue to breed from, only, the best of each succeeding generation over a period of years—only by such a breeding program, can a better variety of plants, or breed of animals be developed by crossbreeding. And no new worthwhile varieties of plants can be developed by crossing, just any of the many varieties of any specie and continue to plant—at random—year after year the seed from such a cross. Neither can you cross, just any of the breeds of animals of any specie, then breed—at random—from the offspring of such a cross, and produce a herd of animals that are—even as good—as the parental stock. This is true, because

—as I have previously stated—the hybrid vigor, resulting from crossbreeding of plants and animals, is lost after the first generation. Therefore, to breed from the offspring of cross bred animals, means an inferior herd; and to continue to plant—after the first generation—the seed from crossbred plants, it means a reduced yield for the farmer. All farmers who plant hybrid seed corn are well aware of this fact; they know that they must buy new seed from the breeder each year, or suffer a reduced yield. And any farmer, who produces crossbred meat animals, knows that he must have pure blood animals to cross, otherwise his herd soon becomes unprofitable.

And all this is not my theories. But instead—all that I have been telling you are proven facts by well known plant and animal breeders, well versed in plant and animal genetics. So, it boils down to this:

If the same principles apply to mankind—and Boas and other anthropologists say they do—as they do in plant and animal breeding, then the crossing of the diverse races of mankind can result in nothing but inferior human beings. And there can be no such thing as developing a superior race in mankind by crossing the different races—because if this was possible at all—it would have to be done under a controlled breeding program, such as I have described for plants and animals. But such as this being done with human beings is unthinkable. So, in effect, plant and animal breeders have said that to cross the diverse races of mankind will produce inferior races; and as I have previously stated, past and present historical facts prove beyond a doubt that this is true. And once again, to show you that past history does prove—beyond a doubt—that race-mixing in the past has produced inferior races, I want to call your attention, once

again, to Boas' statement concerning Spain, when he said:

"It is interesting to note that Spain's greatness followed the period of greatest race mixture, and its decline set in when the population became stable and immigration stopped."

What Boas has told us here is this: After immigration stopped, soon, there were no more pure bloods to mix in Spain; and when there were no more pure bloods to mix, Spain's decline set in. Well—this is exactly what plant and animal breeders have shown by experimentation: that you cannot breed from the offspring of cross bred animals without developing an inferior, un-profitable herd; and if the seed of cross bred plants—after the first generation—are planted, the yield will be reduced.

Well—all this is what happened in Spain: After immigration stopped, there were no more pure bloods to be crossed, so the people of Spain became an inferior people, as compared to the people previous and during the mixing. Therefore, it must be obvious that the major factor causing the downfall of Spain was the mixing of diverse races.

And what happened in Spain, happened to Rome; it happened to Greece; and it happened to all the other great ancient civilizations: They all fell after being mixed with diverse races. And today—all nations whose population is a mixture of diverse races—are backward nations, as compared with nations with the least mixture. There are no exceptions to this, and I challenge the world to prove otherwise. Therefore, it must be obvious that race mixing of diverse races have played the major role in the fall of the great nations down through ages.

CHAPTER III

WHAT DOES THE NEGRO WANT?

What does the Negro want? Of course there are many things that the Negro wants; but in this discussion, we will only consider what the Negro wants and hopes to get from integrated schools; and why does he want to mingle with the white race in public parks, cafes, hotels, swimming pools, trains and all other places.

Some people do not always tell what they want in words. We are all acquainted with this kind of maneuvering. Especially, is this true, when some one is after something that he must keep a secret if he hopes to get it. So, it is not uncommon to hear the expression: "That man's actions show that he is after something else." So, we must always watch a person's actions, especially is this true, when a person is sponsoring something that will be beneficial to himself.

The Negro is not satisfied with schools that are equal to those of the white race; the Negro is not satisfied with parks, swimming pools, cafes, railway coaches, hotels and other public places that are equal in every respect to those of the white race. No, he is not satisfied, no matter if his school is better than the white man's school. He is only satisfied when his children can sit down beside white children—that is the only kind of school that the Negro wants. It is obvious then that the Negro wants something more than an equal opportunity for his children to get an education.

Sometimes his words reveal this; but more often, it is his actions.

During the last few decades, there have been many books, of various descriptions, written concerning the Negro in all phases of every description concerning the Negro's life. Many of these books have been written under the direction of various organizations. For instance, in 1935, The American Youth Commission was set up by the American Council on Education. The purpose of this commission was to make a study of the American youth. From a study of four separate regions of the United States, four different books were written concerning the various aspects of the lives of the American Negro youths. In addition to these volumes, a fifth book was written, a summary of the knowledge previously available concerning Negro youth in the United States.

Then, as I have previously stated, in 1937, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, brought Gunnar Myrdal, who termed himself, a "Social Engineer," over from Sweden, for the purpose of investigating the many and various aspects of the American Negro; and then to write a book of his findings. As a result of this investigation, we have Myrdal's book, *"An American Dilemma."*

Besides these books, there have been a host of others, written by individual authors—all concerning various aspects of the life of the Negro.

So, from all this vast amount of research work that has been done on the Negro, we should have a pretty clear picture as to what the Negro wants—what is he after—by attempting to force the children, the men and women of the white race to mingle with him in the many various walks of life. We have all the information that we need—it is a clear picture. The

authors of the various books that I have just mentioned—without intending to—have given us that information. I have read many of these books, including Myrdal's "*An American Dilemma*," those written under the direction of the American Youth Commission, and quite a few of the many others. Of all the many writers on the Negro subject, they are almost 100 per cent in agreement on one thing. That one thing goes like this:

"That there is color discrimination within Negro groups—a dark color being looked upon as a badge of lowly status; that in homes where some of the children have dark skin, and some light skin, quite often, there is friction in such homes—the children with the dark skin feel like their parents give preference to the lighter skin children; that a light skin is a great advantage in seeking a marriage partner; and that Negroes seek marriage partners of light skin so that their children will have a heritage of whiter color."

Myrdal in his work, "*An American Dilemma*," explains it like this: "The American order of color caste has even more directly stamped the Negro class system by including relative whiteness as one of the main factors determining status within the Negro community . . . Darker Negroes who rose from the masses to distinction in the Negro community by getting an education or by conducting successful business enterprises showed an almost universal desire to marry light skin women and so to become adopted members of the light-colored aristocracy and to give their children a heritage of lighter color. Blackness of skin remained undesirable and even took on an association of badness . . . Perhaps of even greater importance is the fact that the Negro community itself has accepted this color preference. In conversation Negroes often try

to deny or to minimize this fact. But there are a number of indications which an observer cannot help recording. For one thing, many individual Negroes will be found, when speaking about themselves, to rate their own color lighter than it actually is, but practically none to rate it darker. The desire on the part of Negro women of all shades and in all social classes to bleach their skin and straighten their hair—observed decades ago by Ray Stannard Baker and William Archer—has been the basis for some of the most important Negro Business and some of the largest fortunes. Cosmetics for such purposes are most prominently advertised in the Negro press. The pictures of the social lions displayed on the social pages of the Negro newspapers give evidence in the same direction, as does listening to the undertones of conversation in Negro society even when an outsider is present.

"Cliques, clubs, and social life in general seem to be permeated by this color preference. The color problem enters into the Negro home, where children show differences in shades, and into the schools. In marriage selection, as we have had occasion to mention previously, it becomes a dominant factor."

In his work, *"Negro Youth at the Crossways,"* E. Franklin Frazier states it like this:

"Color differences within the same family may become the basis of invidious distinctions. In those lower-class families where the sense of family solidarity is strong, the parents will attempt to prevent discussions concerning these differences. But in families lacking a feeling of solidarity, color differences may become the source of bitter antagonism. The child of dark complexion not only may become bitter toward members of his own family but may also constantly

engage in aggression toward those in the outside world." Frazier continues by saying:

"Many lower-class youth say frankly that if they were born again they would prefer to be white, and it is true that Negro newspapers both create and reflect this attitude through their numerous advertisements of products to whiten or bleach the skin."

In speaking of color discrimination in schools by teachers, Frazier had this to say: "But the overwhelming opinion on this point, in Louisville as in Washington, was that the teachers favor the lighter children, especially those of the upper class. Let us, therefore, hear what the children have to say on this point. A thirteen-year-old girl asked the interviewer, 'Do you know Miss X at Y School?' and without waiting for a reply continued:

'I hate her. When she gives plays she only puts the real light children in them with long pretty hair. She always lets them go on her errands, too. An' she don't never let no dark children do nothin'. Or, if she does have to use 'em in a play, she always gives 'em the shortest, backwardest parts.' "

Frazier goes on and quotes a number of students whose statements are similar to the one quoted here, then he continues:

"During an interview with a teacher who denied that any preference was shown upper-class or lighter children, the interviewer observed that on three occasions when the teacher wanted a pupil to run errands or do something for her a light child was selected despite the fact that several dark children eagerly sought the attention of the teacher when she asked for volunteers to run errands or do whatever was to be done."

To show the color discrimination that is practiced in cliques and clubs, Frazier declares:

"Generally, color discrimination among upper-class youth appears in the more intimate groups such as cliques and clubs. This was apparent in one of the exclusive clubs among high school boys. According to several members of the club, membership is limited to 'boys of good character, outstanding achievements, good manners, and a good family background.' It is true that the boys who compose the club measured up to these requirements. But there were boys having the same qualifications who said they were excluded because of their dark complexion. A study of the skin color of the members revealed that with one exception they ranged in color from medium-brown to a fair complexion. . . . The presence of the single member of dark-brown complexion was on the surface a refutation of the statements of dark upper-class boys that dark boys were excluded, but a study of the actual situation indicated that the upper-class dark member of the club owed his membership to the fact that his pretty, light-skinned sisters were sought after by the members of the club."

I could go and give many more statements that are similar to these, and written by different authors; but these should be sufficient to convince anyone that there is much discrimination, among Negroes, because of color. All this can mean only one thing:

Negroes, as a whole, do not like the color of black when it is applied to themselves; that if it was possible, they had rather be white themselves; but this being impossible, they will seek the fairest-skinned marriage partner possible, so that their children will be whiter.

But many of the investigators of the Negro problem, place the blame for the Negro's attitude toward his own color on the white man. They say the reason can be found from the valuation placed on a white skin by

the white man, valuing a dark skin as a badge of inferiority.

But is the white man to blame for this? Is the Negro to blame? What are the facts? We have the facts. Let us take a look—in that way, we will know.

In Brazil, there is no color line—a dark color is not looked upon as a badge of inferiority; inter-racial marriage between all races is not frowned upon; a man is looked upon according to his achievements and not according to the color of his skin; yet, in Brazil, the Negro does not like his color—not a bit better than the Negro in the United States.

Donald Pierson has studied the Negro problem in Brazil, and has written a book on this subject, titled, "*Negroes in Brazil.*" He tells the story like this:

"Miscegenation is also favored in Bahia today by the prestige which ordinarily attaches to the so-called 'whiter' child. Dark mothers who bear 'whiter' children consider themselves especially favored and are so looked upon by their immediate associates. A black mother proudly showed her light child and said, 'Estou limpando a minha' ('I am cleansing my race'). One also often hears in Bahia the expression *melhorando a raca* ('improving the breed')."

"Joao Varella, in a booklet entitled *Da Bahia Do Senhor do Bomfim*, reproduces the figure of a Negro woman bearing a young child bound to her back by a wide cloth. 'When the child was black and ugly,' Varella writes, 'he was usually carried in this fashion. If, however, he was a coisa mais limpa (literally, 'a cleaner thing'), he was borne in front, in his mother's arms, so that all the world might the more readily see him.'

"The desire to marry 'whiter' is not limited to the female portion of the black population. Successful

males here, as in Haiti and the United States, generally seek to insure further their status and that of their children by marrying lighter-colored women. A common expression heard in this connection is: 'I don't want to go back to Africa.' "

Thus it can be seen that in Brazil where there is no color line, the Negroes there, just don't like being Negroes—they don't like being black. That is the way it is in Brazil and that is the way it is in these United States. This is what the Negroes, for years, have been telling the many investigators of the Negro problem. Here is a sample of what Negroes think about black as stated by Charles S. Johnson, on page 259 of his work, *Growing Up in the Black Belt*, when he states:

"The interviews revealed results similar to those of the tests. Some of the reactions to blackness were as follows: 'Black is too black,' 'Black is ugly,' 'Black people are mean,' 'Black isn't like flesh,' 'Black is bad because people make fun, and I don't think it looks good either,' 'Black people can't use make-up,' 'Black people are evil,' 'White looks better than black,' 'No black people hold good jobs,' 'Black people can't look nice in their clothes,' 'You can't get along with black people,' 'Black looks dirty,' 'Black people have to go to the kitchen and scrub,' 'Even in college they don't want to take in black students,' 'Black youth are called by such derisive names as 'Snow,' 'Gold Dust Boys,' 'Blue Gums,' 'Midnight,' 'Shadow,' 'Haint,' 'Dusty,' 'Polish,' and 'Shine.' "

Why, or how a person came into possession of something that he does not like, is not too important every time. But the plain truth is: if any person has anything—it is immaterial what that thing is—that he does not like, then that person is going to get rid of that

thing, if it is possible to do so. That is human nature—Negroes are humans.

So, it is immaterial, why, or how the Negro came to dislike his own color. The important thing is that there is a large segment of Negroes that don't like their own color. This being true, it is just natural for the Negro to want to rid himself of the thing that he dislikes so much. He would be going contrary to human nature if this was not true. Therefore, it is easily understood why Negroes have been seeking, for a very long time, marriage partners with skins of the lighter colors. The Negro just simply wants his identity as a Negro to become lost. He would like to see the color black, as applied to himself, wiped clean from the whole face of the earth.

But the Negro knows that this can never be done, unless there is wholesale inter-racial marrying with the white race; and he also knows that there can never be wholesale marrying between whites and blacks, unless there is wholesale association of the two races with each other, especially between the children of the races while they are young. He knows that all human beings are, mostly, what they have been taught, especially while they were young.

It is not generally known that there are prominent Negroes that are declaring that the only way to solve the race problem is by miscegenation (Inter-breeding of races), but it is true. For a long time, the Negroes—by their actions—have been telling us that racial inter-breeding was the solution to the racial problem; but now they are telling us in words. But generally this is still not brought out into the open; but it is being talked about among the Negroes of this Nation. In their book, "*Color and Human Nature*," W. Lloyd Warner, Buford H. Junker, and Walter A. Adams

tell the world that some Negroes are declaring that the only real solution to the race problem is the interbreeding of the races. On page 16 of their work, *"Color and Human Nature,"* you will find this statement:

"While Negro solidarity is one response to the segregated existence imposed upon the group, another finds expression in the protest that is constantly turning up to the effect that the 'race problem can only be solved by miscegenation.' "

Then on page 167 of this same work, Warner, Junker and Adams have much to say concerning a Dr. Covey, whom they say is a prominent Chicago Negro doctor. They confirm this belief by the following statement concerning the doctor; and then follow it up by quoting Dr. Covey on the subject of miscegenation, like this:

"His position is so secure that only rarely is it necessary for him to talk like a race man and assert his loyalty to the colored group. He can even tell a brownskin skin interviewer that he advocates miscegenation and doesn't blame Negroes for preferring the physical attributes of the white race:

'The racial problem can only be solved by miscegenation. Inter-marriage should be encouraged, particularly in America, which is a melting pot for most nationalities. When there is one group not absorbed, it is physically isolated and therefore easily segregated.' "

Thus in this last paragraph, Dr. Covey has spoken in words what a large segment of the Negro population wants. He has spoken in words what untold numbers of Negroes have been saying, by their actions, for a long time. Who can be so dumb as not to see it? As Reuter pointed out:

"In the United States almost every Negro of prominence from Frederick Douglass to Jack Johnson has married a white woman or a light-colored mulatto."

Walter White, a long time leader of the NAACP, proved by his actions what he believed in and what he was fighting for: he divorced his Negro wife and married a white woman; and he advocated the repeal of all laws prohibiting inter-racial marriages.

Shortly after the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision, White was asked by an interviewer of the "*U.S. News and World Report*," this question:

"Do you think that the association of pupils in public schools could possibly lead to an increase in inter-marriage between the races?"

White replied: " 'That could be true. When human beings get to know each other, friendships develop and some of those friendships develop into love and into marriage.' "

There is much direct proof from Negroes themselves that proves that Negroes are marrying whites in preference to Negroes, every time an opportunity presents itself. In the September 5th, 1952 issue of the "*U.S. News and World Report*," was a report of an interview with Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., a member of Congress, from the state of New York. The subject of that interview was: "What the American Negro Wants." Among the subjects discussed was inter-racial marriages. The most pertinent questions asked Powell concerning inter-racial marriages follow with Powell's complete answer to each question:

Q: "Do you think many of the people who oppose discontinuing segregation are afraid breaking down of the social lines may lead to intermarriage?"

A: " 'That is the great bugaboo used to scare them, when the truth is that when two people are in love—

black, white, Gentile, Protestant, Catholic—no one can stop them.' "

Q: "What is the attitude of the Negro leaders toward the intermarriage question? Do they feel that it is a probability over a long period of time?"

A: " 'Yes, they do, but not as any conscious thing to get out and campaign for.' "

Q: "They think that, ultimately, intermarriage will be commonplace in this country?"

A: " 'Personally, I do.' "

Q: "Do you think that the presence of a good many Negro troops in Europe where there's been intermarriage has affected the problem?"

A: " 'No, I don't, because I have just come back from an official five-month trip through Europe and the Near East, and there is no problem over there.' "

Q: "You mean intermarriage is accepted?"

A: " 'Yes, they don't understand our fears here in America.' "

Q: "Do you think there is much intermarriage in Europe?"

A: " 'Oh, yes, a great deal.' "

Q: "Could you say in what countries it is more frequent? Is there a country that you could name?"

A: " 'I don't think I could say. I saw it all through Scandinavia. I saw it all through the Benelux countries and in Italy.' "

Q: "But isn't it a small minority?"

A: " 'No. In comparison with the number of Negroes there, it was large.' "

Q: "In comparison with the number of intermarriages in the United States, would you say that it was an equal or a greater number or a lesser number?"

A: " 'On a percentage basis there is no comparison. It is much more prevalent abroad. In fact, the rare

thing in Europe and England is to find a couple that is not an interracial marriage. I saw very few marriages of two Negro people.' "

Q: "It was mostly Negro and white?"

A: " 'That's right.' "

Q: "What is the attitude of the Negro in the United States on the subject of intermarriage? Is it discussed frequently in the press?"

A: " 'Yes, but on an objective basis. In fact, an increasingly large number of Negro leaders are marrying whites of extremely stable and respected families.' "

Q: "Is there much more fraternizing in the Northern cities between Negroes and whites, especially in the large Negro centers like Harlem, than there used to be?"

A: " 'Yes, much more.' "

Q: "Is there any tendency among the Negroes to reject that, or are they welcoming it?"

A: " 'They are very definitely welcoming it. An increasing number of fine leaders on both sides are marrying.' "

Q: "What is the argument that is used by Negro leaders in answer to the point that is sometimes made that, if intermarriage continues in the next 25 or 30 years, then the races will be adulterated somewhat as they are in Cuba and Brazil?"

A: " 'I have heard that argument, but it doesn't amount to any argument at all from my standpoint, because we are fighting for integration, well, then, there it is. I mean, you can't fight against segregation and want separation. We must be consistent.' "

Q: "I am not sure that that is clear—"

A: " 'The Negro leaders are fighting against segregation. Therefore, they can't have a position on one

hand against segregation and on the other hand against interracial marriage.' "

All these answers of Powell confirm what I have been trying to tell you: that all the fuss for integrated schools and the forced mingling of Negroes and whites in many other places, is only the means that leads to the final goal—interracial marriage. That is what the Negro wants.

Powell states emphatically that the Negro leaders are welcoming interracial marriages; but he also states that it is not "any conscious thing to go out and campaign for." Why? Because he knows that it is not necessary. He knows that if whites and Negroes can be forced to associate together—especially children while they are young—then interracial marriages will naturally follow. This he knows is the history of all past inter-mingling of different races. For proof of this, he only has to recall the ancient civilizations of Egypt, Mesopotamia, Greece, Rome and not too far in the distant past Spain. Then for further proof, he can get it closer to home. He has only to look South—South from the Rio Grande—down through Mexico, Central and South America; and there before his eyes, he views a panorama of mongrel races—all the result of racial integration in all walks of life, thus resulting in close social association of the various races.

Integrated schools and other integrated places is the Trojan Horse through which the Negroes hope to bring about this close racial association, resulting in interracial marriages. That is what the Negro wants. Who is dumb? It is not the Negro. He knows where he is going.

CHAPTER IV

THE COMMUNIST AND INTEGRATION

I have pointed out previously that Franz Boas and his disciples did not have any scientific basis for their theory that the mixing or crossbreeding of the various races is not detrimental to mankind. But on the other hand, historical facts prove that race mixing has been the major factor in the downfall of all the great civilizations of the past; and that race mixing today can be blamed for the backwardness of the unprogressive nations of this world right now. Briefly, let me repeat the cause for this.

Experiments with both plants and animals prove, conclusively, that crossbreeding, indiscriminately, can result in nothing but an inferior and unprofitable herd, in case of animals; and in the case of plants, a reduced yield of inferior quality. In other words, for crossbreeding to be successful, it must be controlled. In the case of animals, you must always have purebreds to cross; and in the case of plants, you must always have purebred seed to cross. Thus it can be readily seen that if a farmer can hope to continue a successful crossbreeding program, he must always have a source of purebreds to cross, otherwise his crossbreeding program will end in failure. In the case of animals or plants, this is possible. The farmer can produce his own purebreds or he can purchase them from someone else.

But in human beings, all this is not possible. For instance, in any nation where its population consists of

two or more different races, it would be impossible to permit these races to inter-marry without all being amalgamated into one race. In other words, the time would come when there would be no more pure bloods in that nation. When that time came—and it would surely come sooner or later—then such a nation would be faced with the same problems that a farmer would have trying to stay in the cattle business with nothing to breed from except a herd of crossbred animals. Nothing will put a farmer out of the cattle business quicker than breeding from crossbred animals. This is not a theory; this is a scientific fact.

Likewise, nothing has ever been as destructive to the great civilizations built by man than the crossbreeding of the various diverse races of mankind. It was the major factor causing the fall of all the ancient civilizations. Therefore, there is no reason to believe that any nation that exists today can escape similar fate, if such nation permits the mixing of diverse races within that nation.

There is one thing that I want to stress; and it is not a theory—it is a fact: No crossbreeding program can be successful—no matter whether it be plants or animals—unless it is controlled, so that there will always be a supply of purebreds on hand from which the crossing is to be made. In animal breeding, this is possible; but in human beings, this is an impossibility. Therefore, this being an impossibility, there is not one iota of scientific proof that race mixing is not detrimental to mankind. It just simply does not exist. On this, I challenge the world.

Now, in the face of these facts, why did Franz Boas, a foreign anthropologist, come to these United States in 1886 and begin to teach in Columbia University the doctrine that the mixing of the various races of man-

kind would not result in any deleterious effects on mankind?

Sometimes, men put theories before the public that cannot be easily proved; but it is a rare thing for a man to advance a theory; put every thing that he has into it to convince the world of its truth; yet he knows all the while that his theory cannot stand up when it is faced with the cold hard facts. So, it should be obvious that when this is done, there is something sinister behind the whole thing—something that is not true, is being made to appear to be true.

Boas was in this position. He knew that his racial theory could not survive if ever faced with the truth; yet he preached all his life that it was true. But when faced with death, he changed his tune. His last words were: "I have a new theory about race." What does this mean? Does it mean that Boas really had a new theory about race, or does it mean that Boas facing death, knew that there was one that he could not deceive—God his Maker. Who knows? But any way you look at it, this last statement of Boas makes all his other works worthless. But in spite of this, the academic world accepts Boas' works as scientific facts—the world goes on being deceived.

The Communists are the greatest deceivers that the world has ever known; and the whole world knows this—it is no secret. The whole line of Communist propaganda is based on deception. All the major leaders of Communism have voiced their acception of the idea of deception as the most important means by which they hope to gain their goal of a one world government. Karl Marx, of course, being the first.

In a speech at Amsterdam, Holland, in 1872, Marx was advising his comrades on tactics to be employed in reaching their goal, when he said: "We know that

the institutions, the manners, and the customs of the various countries must be considered . . ."

In this same speech, Marx, especially, mentioned America and England where the goal of the Communists might be reached "by peaceful means." So, it is obvious that when the plan of action was drawn up for the seizure of the government of this Nation, the first objective was to place Communist teachers in our higher institutions of learning, such as our colleges, universities and theological seminaries. By this means, they hoped to produce the necessary leaders, right here among us, to carry on their work of deception. This they have succeeded in doing. This was natural for the Communists to do. They had been trained by Marx to do this very thing; and all advice ever given by Marx has been followed—none has ever been repudiated.

So, in 1886—only a few years after Marx had advised his fellow comrades when planning their plan of action for the overthrow of the government of the United States, and other countries, that they should take in consideration the institutions, manners and customs of all countries—we find Boas at Columbia University, teaching his racial equalitarian philosophy—the doctrine environment and not race makes a man what he is; and that the mixing or inter-breeding of the different races of man was not detrimental to mankind. While spending a lifetime teaching a doctrine that could not be substantiated by cold hard facts, Boas' actions prove whose interest he was working for. There is evidence that proves that Boas worked to further the cause of Communism. Of this, there can be no doubt.

In the April, 1958 issue of American Mercury magazine, Harold Lord Varney, in an article, titled,

"Red Hues in the Columbia Blue," among other things, describes Boas' connection with the Communists like this:

"Appropriately, there has always been an unconcealed affinity of Boas anthropologists for socialist and Communist causes. Boas himself, after a lifetime of pretended non-partisanship, went overboard for the Communist line during the war. He signed the famous March 5, 1941, statement defending the Communist Party, then under national condemnation as a result of the Hitler-Stalin Pact. He was one of the 17 who, on March 19, 1940, had protested against the decision of the American Civil Liberties Union to exclude Communist Party members from ACLU offices. He was chairman of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom which the Communists set up in 1939. He had 15 other listings behind his name for activity in organizations cited by official government agencies as "communist fronts." There can be little question where Boas' sympathies lay. His disciples, Bernhard J. Stern and Gene Weltfish, were even more conspicuous than Boas in their Communist front infiltrations."

Thus it can be seen that Boas served the Communists well. He served so well until the whole academic world has accepted his racial doctrine that has no foundation. Today it is being proclaimed, not only in our institutions of learning, but also from the pulpits of many churches of this Nation. No people, in all history, has ever been more deceived than the American people by Franz Boas.

There is much other proof that the Communists are the instigators of all our racial problems. In 1913, Israel Cohen, a high ranking Communist of England,

wrote a book, titled, "*A Racial Program For The 20th Century*," in which Cohen wrote:

"We must realize that our party's most powerful weapon is racial tension. By propounding into the consciousness of the dark races that for centuries they have been oppressed by the whites, we can mould them to the program of the Communist Party.

"In America, we will aim for subtle victory. While inflaming the Negro minority against the Whites, we will instill in the whites a guilt complex for their exploitation of the Negroes. We will aid the Negro to rise to prominence in every walk of life in the professions and in the world of sports and entertainment.

"With this prestige the Negro will be able to intermarry with the whites and begin a process which will deliver America to our cause."

Here Cohen tells the world in plain words that racial tension is the Communist Party's most powerful weapon. But he does not tell the world how this racial tension is to be brought about. But in view of the tactics used by the Communists to accomplish their purpose in all other fields, we could hardly expect honest methods to be used. But lest we forget how the Communists hope to reach their goal, let us refresh our memory by quoting some of the sayings of Marx, Lenin and Khrushchev as follows:

The Communist Manifesto, written by Karl Marx, said this: The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims."

Lenin gave these instructions to his comrades: "We have to use any ruse, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful method, concealment, and veiling of the truth."

On September 17, 1955, Khrushchev gave this warning: "If anyone thinks that our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and

Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. Those who expect this to happen might just as well wait for a shrimp to learn how to whistle."

All these things, taken together, from Marx to Khrushchev, reveal the master plan that the Communists have devised to be used to bring these United States under the goal of Communism. First, Marx advised the use of deception in dealing with the Capitalist Countries. Then his admonition was to use this deception in our institutions. What institutions? Of course, he had in mind our institutions of learning, such as our colleges, universities, theological seminaries, our churches, and all organizations, such as labor unions and so on.

Then Israel Cohen, a top Communist Party functionary in England, advised his fellow workers in what field that they should concentrate their work. Not in these words did he do this; but it meant the same thing when he said: "We must realize that our party's most powerful weapon is racial tension." Nothing could be plainer than this. Therefore it is obvious that the Communists have considered for a long time that the racial issue was their most important field of work.

So, knowing that deception is one of their chief tools in all their work, it is but reasonable to believe when dealing with the racial issue, the Communists will make use of every ruse, every trick, and all the cunning that can be thought of to deceive, not only the people of the United States, but all the world. That is their method of doing all their work. That is the way Karl Marx advised it to be done; that is the way Lenin said to do it; and Khrushchev said: "If anyone thinks that our smiles mean the abandonment of the

teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly."

Now, what more do we need to prove that the Communists are the real force that is stirring up all our racial troubles; and what more do we need to prove that Franz Boas—a man who served the Communists well—used his "equalitarian racial doctrine" to deceive, not only the American people, but the people of the whole world.

But you may ask, why have the Communists been able to deceive us? Do we not have the means to counteract this propaganda? Do we not have a free press with its many newspapers and magazines to rightly inform the people; and do we not have one of the finest educational systems in the world to train our young women and men for leadership? Then in the face of all this, how could we be misled? How could we be tricked and deceived when we have so many ways by which we may be informed.

To understand how all this is possible in a nation such as ours, we must understand something of the things that go to make a man what he is. With few exceptions, most people are, mostly, what they have been taught; and what we have been taught—outside the home—have taken place, mostly, in the public schools, colleges and universities.

In our public schools, colleges and universities—everything can be taught, including the theory of evolution, all forms of atheism, including Communism, and all other things that can be thought of, except one thing. That one exception is this: God and His works cannot be taught in our public schools and colleges. This the Supreme Court has said cannot be done in these institutions. So, while these public institutions cannot teach God and His works—cannot

teach that God is the creator of the universe and everything in it, these same institutions can teach that the universe was brought into being by all manner of theories; and that all living things evolved from one single cell. Therefore, it is impossible for the people of this Nation to be well informed concerning the works of God; yet they are well informed concerning the theory of evolution, atheism, and Communism.

And because of this one-sided educational system, the Communists have been able to brainwash the American people with Franz Boas' equalitarian racial philosophy—to the extent that many of the best educated people of this Nation—are fighting for the mingling of the Negro and white races in all walks of life. They are doing this, in spite of the fact that they know that in the end, that it means the mongrelization of the races. Why can this be? The answer is simple:

No man is capable of rendering a true, honest and an impartial verdict in any controversial case, unless he has been, equally, as well informed on both sides of the question under consideration; and no man that was accused of having committed a crime, would be considered as having had a fair trial, if he was denied the opportunity to present his side of the story to the jury. But this is the status that we find the racial problem in right now. The jury that is deciding this case has never, really, heard but one side of this case.

The jurors that are deciding the racial case that concerns all our racial problems, were students—in most cases—in our colleges and universities yesterday. It was while attending these institutions that they heard the evidence upon which they depend to reach their verdict. It went something like this:

The human race is one, biologically speaking; there is no fundamental difference between the various races,

and what difference there is, is due to environment; that environment and not race makes a man what he is; and the mixing, or the inter-breeding of the various races, would not be detrimental to mankind.

This about sums up the equalitarian racial philosophy as preached by Boas and his disciples. It leaves God, the Creator of all things out of the picture. Therefore, only one side has ever been presented to the jury that is deciding the racial issue; and as things now stand, we can never present the evidence for the other side where it is needed mostly—in our colleges and universities. This is so, because we cannot present our evidence without bringing God and the story of creation as told in the Bible into the case. The Supreme Court has said that we cannot do this.

The Communists know what they are doing. Karl Marx knew what he was doing, when way back in 1872, he told his Communist comrades, that when considering the strategy to be used to overthrow the government of this Nation, that our institutions, customs and manners "must be considered." Israel Cohen knew what he was doing when he said, "We must realize that our party's most powerful weapon is racial tension." All the Communists knew that if they could infiltrate our colleges and universities that they would be free to indoctrinate the students of those institutions with their racial philosophy without fear of any rebuttal in those same institutions, because our Supreme Court has said that we could not do it. In view of all of this there is no wonder that Lenin declared:

"First, we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an over-ripe fruit into our hands."

No, there is no need for the Communists to attack this Nation. Their goal is being reached by brainwashing through the process of infiltration, not only in our schools, but into our every walk of life. Next to our schools as a center of activities, come our churches. Many preachers, some conscious of what they are doing, others are not, are "carrying the Ball" for the Communists' brainwashing program.

Surely by now, you should realize that it is the Communists that are trying to destroy this Nation by creating racial discord.

CHAPTER V

GOD AND SEGREGATION

God is all powerful; or He has no power. God is Supreme in all things; else, He is nothing. God is the Creator of all things; otherwise, the whole Bible is a myth. But the Bible is no myth, because God is all powerful; He is Supreme in all things; and He is the Creator of all things. Besides the Bible, we have much proof that is a witness to the fact that God was the Creator of the universe and all that is in it. But the Bible—which is the word of God—is a direct witness to this fact. And in Colossian 1:16, we find a statement that leaves no doubt as to who is the Creator of all things, where it reads like his:

“For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him.”

This, with the story of creation as told in the first chapter of Genesis, should be enough to convince any one—especially those who confess to believe in a living God—that God is the Creator of all things. But this is by no means the case. Because we have preachers and religious organizations proclaiming to the world that the different races of mankind came about by natural causes—environmental factor, or otherwise.

In a pamphlet, titled, “*Race—What does the Bible say?*”, printed and distributed by, The Council For

Social Action, The Congregational Christian Churches, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, New York, you will find these statements:

"The Old Testament recognizes that diverse races, nations and languages have come from a common stock by a natural process.

"Apart from the distinction of Jew and Gentile the Old Testament takes for granted the existence of many races and nations, traces their origin to the natural course of human development, but does not lay down any doctrine or ideal either of separation or of assimilation between Gentile races either in the present or in the past."

These statements would sound more natural if they had come from some ardent exponent of the theory of evolution. But all evolutionists do not agree as to the origin of the different races, especially is this true concerning the color of the skin of the various races. And as I have pointed out previously, Darwin admitted that environmental factors—such as different climates—could not have been responsible for the different skin colors in the various races. Even Franz Boas, one of the most ardent supporters of race-mixing that I have ever read after, holds the same views as Darwin does on this subject. On page 58, of his book, *"Race, Language and Culture,"* Boas has this to say:

"At the present time it is unknown to what extent the influences of environment may determine bodily form. Notwithstanding the numerous claims of the fundamental effect of climate upon the body of man, we have no evidence whatever that will show that pigmentation undergoes fundamental changes under climatic conditions; that the white race would become darker in the tropics; or that the Negroes would become lighter in the north. Whatever statistics we have

on this subject show rather a remarkable stability of pigmentation."

Thus it is: The great Charles Darwin, one of the greatest exponents of the theory of evolution, and Franz Boas, the anthropologist whose racial equalitarian doctrine has been accepted by many of the best educated people of this Nation and of the entire world as scientific facts, have declared that climatic factors, such as hot and cold climates, were not responsible for the different skin colors in the various races.

Now—if natural factors, such as different climates—were not the factors that produced the different skin colors in the various races, then natural factors—such as different climates—could not have been responsible for creating the different races, because skin color is the most distinguishing characteristic in all the races. But of course, there are other racial traits in all the races, but skin color is the one that stands out—it is the distinguishing feature in all races. By it, each race can be easily distinguished from all others. Therefore, it is obvious that each race was given a different skin color, so that each race could be easily identified. So, to say that the different races came into being by natural causes, just does not make sense. And the only logical answer as to the origin of the races is: God was their Creator, just like He created everything else.

This I want you to note carefully: In the pamphlet: *"Race—What does the Bible say?"*, the writer of this pamphlet says that the Old Testament lays down no doctrine for the separation of any races—except Jews and Gentiles. But is this so? In my opinion, it has no foundation, because in Gen. 1:24, God gave this command to all living things, when He said: "Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind,

cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind; and it was so."

But you may ask, does this command apply to mankind, and if it does, does it apply to each individual race? The answer to these questions must be yes, because all men are living creatures; and all races of mankind are different living creatures, just like black birds are different living creatures from red birds, or blue birds, or any of the many other different kinds of birds. And God has commanded that all living creatures "bring forth after its kind."

Besides the religious organizations, there are ministers of the Gospel, who are—directly, or indirectly—spreading the doctrine that natural factors—and not God—were the maker of all the various races of mankind. They cannot prove this, yet they continue to spread this atheistic doctrine. As an example, let us listen to what one minister of the Gospel has to say.

The Reverend Dr. Everett Tilson, a Methodist Minister and an associate professor of biblical theology at Vanderbilt University, and the author of the book, *"Segregation and the Bible,"* in speaking of the origin of the races in this book, on page twenty, makes this statement:

"Though we are 'still largely in ignorance of the exact ways in which biological processes work to form new physical types,' at least we can say this without fear of reproof: no reputable scientist has yet attempted to account for the origin of the three major racial groups within a single generation from a set of common parents."

Here Dr. Tilson was commenting on the theory of the Reverend G. T. Gillespie, and others, who hold that the three major racial groups originated after the flood through the three sons of Noah, Shem, Ham and

Japheth. And here we find Dr. Tilson making the statement that the scientists do not know by what process the different races were formed; yet he calls in the scientists to prove that the three major racial groups could not have originated during one generation. Dr. Tilson admits by his own statement—that the scientists do not have the answers as to how the different races originated, yet he calls on these same scientists to prove that the three major racial groups could not have had their origin during one generation. But if Dr. Tilson had turned to the Bible for his answers—instead of the scientists—he would have found that all this was possible with God. He would have found that when God gets ready to do a thing—no matter how impossible it looks to man—God does it, and He does it at the time that He wants it done. And to refresh your memory let us take a look at a few things that man thought were impossible, yet God did that very thing.

When Abraham and Sarah, his wife, were informed by the Lord that Sarah would become a mother in her old age, both Abraham and Sarah laughed, thinking that this was impossible, because it was contrary to the laws of nature. Then Sarah asked: "Shall I of a surety bear a child, which am old? And the Lord replied: Is anything too hard for the Lord? (Gen. 18: 13, 14).

Then when Gabriel, the angel appeared unto Mary and informed her that she was to become the mother of Jesus Christ, Mary wondered how this could be, and asked the angel: "How shall this be, seeing I know not man?" And the angel answered: ". . . For with God nothing shall be impossible." (Luke 1: 27-37).

Then again when Christ said that it was "easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a

rich man to enter into the kingdom of God," his disciples "were exceedingly amazed, saying, "Who then can be saved?" Then Jesus answered and said: "With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible." (Matt. 19: 23-26; Luke 18:25-27).

Yes, with men, all these things seemed impossible, but with God all this was possible: Isaac was born unto Sarah in her old age, Christ was born unto Mary; and there is no doubt, many rich men have gone to heaven.

So, if all this—seemingly impossible to man—could actually take place, there is no good reason to believe—that through the power of God—that all races of mankind could not have taken place during a single generation, or a much shorter period of time as far as time is concerned. Because where God is concerned, time does not matter.

But one of two things is a self-evident truth: Either all races were formed by natural processes, or they were created by God. And the scientists have never been able to offer any reliable proof that the various races originated by natural causes. All they have to offer as proof is their own imagination. They just do not believe that God was the Creator of the races, so from their viewpoint, there is no other alternative. It is just like all the other aspects of the theory of evolution: We are offered unproven theories and then asked to believe them as facts. For instance, years ago, Sir Arthur Keith, a noted evolutionist, said: "Evolution is un-proved and un-provable. We believe it because the only alternative is special creation, and that is unthinkable." And then Thomas Huxley, one of the greatest believers of evolution of all times, said without reservation, "It is clear that the doctrine of evolution is directly antagonistic to that of Creation . . .

Evolution, if consistently accepted, makes it impossible to believe the Bible."

But in spite of statements like these by noted evolutionists, many ministers of the Gospels, religious organizations, and other religious leaders, are accepting some aspects of this theory, and some are swallowing the whole "hog." For instance, when any one accepts the doctrine that the different races were developed by natural processes, then that person has accepted—as facts—that this stage in the development of mankind was due to evolution. And there is much proof that shows that there are many in the field of religion—who have accepted evolution, mostly, as the means of creation. For example, F. N. Peloubet, a Doctor of Divinity, and the former Editor of "*Select Notes on the International Sunday School Lessons*," in the Bible Dictionary that bears his name, defines creation in this manner:

"The creation of all things is ascribed in the Bible to God, and is the only reasonable account of the origin of the world. The method of creation is not stated and may have been largely by evolution."

This quotation shows how confused many men of religion have become over the possibility that evolution may have been the means by which all things have come into being. But there is no reason for believing this possibility, because the very foundation of evolution rests upon the assumption that everything has developed or evolved from something else. But in the beginning there was nothing until something was created. Therefore, evolution could not have been the means by which the earth and all the universe came into being, because before something was created, there was nothing from which the earth and all the universe could have developed or evolved from. And

this makes the whole theory of evolution unbelievable, because they have no way to explain the beginning. But even after the beginning—after the earth, all the universe, and life was created by God—there is no evidence to prove that all living things evolved from some lower form of life. But on the other hand, even geology—the witness that the exponents of evolution call in, most often to testify in their behalf—is a witness that God, and not evolution was the Creator of all things. Let us look at some of the facts.

The exponents of evolution rely on geology to prove their theory, because when the fossils in the strata of rocks first show the remains of ancient life, it is in the lower strata and of the lower forms of life. Then each succeeding strata of rocks shows a higher form of life, until finally, in the upper strata, we find the fossils of ancient man.

But if evolution is true, we must have more proof than this. For evolution to be true, the fossils must show the different forms of life of being part one thing and part something else at some stage of the evolutionary process, otherwise the fossils as a witness for evolution are worthless. And nowhere have any fossils yielded any evidence showing that any living creature was ever a part of one kind of a creature and part of something else. And without this there is no evidence that any form of life ever developed or evolved from some other form of life. But on the other hand, the fossils show that when any form of life appeared on earth, it was full grown and in abundance. Wells and Huxley admit this when they said:

“The era of ancient life arrived abruptly and without warning.”

Therefore, if ancient life arrived “abruptly and without warning,” this shows that there was no long

period of evolving from one form of life to another, and this is a necessity, if evolution is true. And Darwin has admitted that fossils do not supply the proof that is needed to connect the missing links of the process of evolution, when he said:

"In the sixth chapter I enumerated the chief objections which might be justly urged against the views maintained in this volume. Most of them have now been discussed. One, namely the distinctness of specific forms, and their not being blended together by innumerable transitional links, is a very obvious difficulty. . . . Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely-graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and serious objection which can be urged against the theory."

Thus Darwin acknowledges that in the strata of the ancient rocks, there are no fossils, which show a transition of a lower form of life to a higher form; yet without this, the theory of evolution has no foundation. But Darwin tries to explain the absence of this proof, like this: "The explanation lies, as I believe, in the extreme imperfection of the geological record." (See chapter 10, "The Origin of Species.").

But may I ask, why is the geological record so complete as to show proof of all living things—and many extinct—yet it holds no evidence of any of the missing links, or transitional forms of any lower form of life to a higher form? This just does not make sense. Because it is reasonable to believe that the same conditions that erased all evidence of the transitional forms—the part forms, and the half and half forms, would have wiped out all evidence of the whole or complete forms of life.

So, it boils down to this: The exponents of evolution have no real proof of the missing transitional links in the process of evolution, except their own imagination. But they believe this, because they do not believe in creation by Divine Power, so—they think creation by evolution is the only alternative.

But in spite of all the vast amount of evidence which shows that creation by evolution is impossible, most of the scientific world has accepted it as facts; and in the field of religion, it has been accepted to a large extent. Then in view of this, why is this possible? The answer is simple: We are, mostly, what we have been taught; and for a hundred years—slowly at first—the young people of this Nation, and the world have been taught—in schools, especially in colleges and universities—creation by evolution, as scientific facts; while at the same time, the story of creation by Divine Power has not been taught to the young people of this Nation in the public schools, colleges and universities, because the Bible cannot be taught in the public schools of this Nation. And because of this, most of the young people have been taught only one side of the story of creation; that is, creation by evolution; and no person is capable of rendering an impartial verdict on any issue, unless he is as well informed on one side of the issue as he is on the other. So, in view of this, there is no wonder that so many of the intellectuals of this Nation believe in evolution—that is what they have been taught.

But there is one thing that is obvious to all: God did not do all His work, or create all things, at one and the same time. This is told by the story of the fossils in the rocks and by God's own word. The lower strata of rocks contain the lower forms of life, while each succeeding upper stratum shows a higher

form of life, until finally in the upper strata are found evidence of the higher forms of life, including man. But—as I have already pointed out—that the fossils show that when any form of life appeared on earth, it came suddenly and in abundance; and there is no evidence in the rocks to show that a lower form of life ever developed or evolved into a higher form of life, with the process continuing until finally man was developed. This leaves the theory of evolution without any foundation.

But before man was created, we only have the story as told in the rocks to show that God did not do all His work at one and the same time; but after the creation of man, we have God's own word that this is true. And from God's own word, we learn that when He created man, He created only one man. Why all the various races were not created at one and the same time, I do not know. Only God can answer this.

And when Adam was created, God gave him certain commands by which to live by. But after a period of time, God gave Noah other commands that were different from those He gave Adam. Then when Abraham came upon the scene, God made a covenant with him and gave him commands that were different from anything that He had given Adam and Noah. Then when Moses came along, God gave him the most complete set of commands—The Ten Commandments—that He had ever given to any man; and to make it more complete, these were the first commands that applied to all people—they apply to all people today. And may I ask, why did God do all this in this manner? Why were the Ten Commandments not given to Adam, or Noah, or Abraham? Why did God wait so long to give the world a code of laws by which to live by? Only God can answer this. But because God

did not give the Ten Commandments to Adam, or Noah, or Abraham, does not prove that they did not come from God.

Then 1960 years ago, God sent His only Son, Jesus Christ, into a sin lost world, as the Savior of all mankind. But Adam and Eve were sinful, the people in the time of Noah, Abraham, Moses, and the prophets were sinful, then may we ask why did God wait so long to send His Son to redeem a sin lost world? This too, only God can answer. But because Jesus Christ was not sent into the world in the time of Adam, or the time of Noah, Abraham, Moses, or the prophets, does not prove that Christ is not the Son of God.

Now, God could have given the Ten Commandments to Adam, just as easy as He gave them to Moses; and He could have given His Son, Jesus Christ, to the world at the time He gave the Ten Commandments to Moses, but He didn't—He was not ready to do these things in the times of Adam and Moses. But because the Ten Commandments were not given to Adam and because Jesus Christ was not sent into the world in the time of Moses, does not minimize the power of God to do these things. God waits until He is ready to do what He wills, then He acts.

Likewise, because man was not created when God created the lower forms of life, does not mean that man evolved from these lower forms of life, and not created directly by God as told in the Bible. And because all races of mankind were not created when Adam was created, does not prove that they were developed by natural processes any more than it is proved that man was created by being evolved, or developed from a lower form of life, and as I have already shown, this is an impossibility.

No, because God did not create all things at one and the same time does not minimize the power of God to create all things. (Col. 1:16) And those who believe that God created all things, believe that all things are what they are because God created them as they are. But those who believe in the theory of evolution, believe that all things are what they are, is by chance, and this includes man and all the various races—they cannot believe otherwise. So, it boils down to this:

The man who believes that God created man in His own image; that God created all races of mankind; and that God created all things, this man believes that God had a special reason for creating everything as He did; and that God would want everything to remain as He had made them. Therefore, this man cannot believe in race-mixing, because, he knows that in the end, this will destroy all races, as he believes God created them.

But on the other hand, the man who believes in the theory of evolution, believes that all things are what they are by accident; he believes that by some process—which is unproven and cannot be proven—that all things, including man, evolved from one single cell, from the slime of the ocean; and he believes that by some, unproven, natural process, all races were developed. So, the man, who believes these things, racial integrity means nothing to him; he has no racial pride—all this, because he is what he is, by accident. And he believes—if he believes there is a God—that the integrity of the races is immaterial with God. And those who believe these things are using their influence to break down racial segregation. And one of the means that they are using is the quoting and misconstruing the Scriptures.

For instance, the Scripture (Acts 17:26) which proclaims that all races were "made of one blood," is hailed by integrationists, as proof that there is no need for segregation. Because—they argue—all races are one human family; that there is but one race—the human race. All this is true—they say—because all races were "made of one blood." But they seem to have forgotten something: they have forgotten that God is all powerful; and they have forgotten that God can take the same material and make things that are very much different from each other. For instance, in Gen. 2:19, the Bible says this: "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air." And we all know that out of the ground—will grow all plants, of all the many varieties, and of all colors; some being good for food, while others are not, and some being even poisonous—all this being possible, only because of the miraculous power of God.

Now, who will dare to say that there is no fundamental difference in all the many animals, or all the many fowls—all because they were all formed out of the ground? And who will dare to say that there is no fundamental difference in all the many plants—all because they will all grow out of the ground? Therefore, it does not make sense to say that there are no fundamental differences in all the races of mankind—all because they were "made of one blood." Because—as we have seen—God is able to take one substance and make many different things out of it—God is all powerful.

Man and all the animals have much in common: God created all, both animals and man; therefore, God is the father of all—animals as well as man. That life may be sustained, all must have oxygen and food;

and the same food that will grow an animal will grow a man. But all this does not prove that there is no fundamental difference between man and animals. That there is a difference is obvious to all.

Where God is concerned, things can be composed of the same substance; yet there can be a vast difference in those things, or in the performance of those things. For instance, Harry Holbert Turney-High, Head of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, of the University of South Carolina, on page 63 of his book, "*General Anthropology*," has this to say:

"The brain cells of apes and men are composed of the same chemical substances. Likewise, apes have the same vocal apparatus as men and use them in the same way, although their sounds only indicate subjective states. Why one species should be supremely articulate and gifted with symbol-making power and the other inarticulate and relatively dumb will probably forever be inexplicable."

Here we have a concrete example of God's power. He takes the same identical chemical substances, from which He makes the brains of men, and the brains of apes; yet while being made of the same substance, there is a vast difference in the performance of the brains of men and the brains of apes. What makes the difference? There can be but one logical answer—God. And likewise, the vocal apparatus of men and apes are the same; but there is a great difference in the way they perform—one can talk, the other cannot. What makes the difference? Here too, there can be but one logical answer—God.

Now, when God made all the races of men "of one blood," He was only exercising His mighty power, as He did when He made brains for men and apes. In one instance, He takes the same chemical substances

and makes brains—brains for men and brains for apes—but brains that are so different—when it comes to performance—until there can be but little comparison between the brains of men and brains of apes.

So, in another instance, God takes another substance—"one blood"—and makes all the various races of mankind. And here too, there are many differences between the races, just as there are differences in the performance of the brains of men and the brains of apes. The color of the skin is outstanding, as well as other racial characteristics.

God, not only made all races different, He separated, or segregated all races. (Acts 17:26; Deut. 32:3) This is a historical fact. Because, as I have previously stated, at the beginning of recorded time—taken as a whole—each race occupied a different part of the world: The Negro was at home in Africa; the home of the white man was in Southwestern Asia and Europe; the brown man occupied Southern Asia; the yellow man dwelt in that vast land that covers most of Central and Northern Asia; and the red man, the American Indian, roamed all the lands of the two Americas.

The fact that all races were segregated at the dawn of recorded history, should be enough evidence to convince anyone with an open mind, that God was the first segregationist. And having once segregated the races, is it not reasonable to believe that God would wish that the races remain segregated? But the only answer that I have ever seen or heard to questions that were similar to this one, goes something like this: "The races are already mixed," the exponents of integration proclaim, "so segregation is useless." But this I deny. Segregation is still worthwhile, because we still have a white race, a Negro race, a yellow race, a brown race, and a red race—although, I do admit that there

have been some race-mixing all down through the ages.

But the jails and penitentiaries of this Nation are overflowing with men—men, who have broken every commandment, ever given by God. Now, you ministers of the Gospel, all other persons in the field of religion, and all other persons, do you recommend that all our criminal laws be repealed—for no other reason, except, they all have been broken? Of course, you would not. Then how can you advocate that racial segregation be ended—just because there has been some race-mixing? It just does not make sense.

On December 5th, 1957, The General Assembly of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., at St. Louis, Missouri, in a statement of policy, said this:

"The General Assembly of the National Council of Churches reaffirms at this time its renunciation of the pattern of racial segregation, both in the churches and in society, as a violation of the Gospel of love and human brotherhood."

In other words, the National Council of Churches, are proclaiming that the "Gospel of love and human brotherhood," demands the end of racial segregation—demands the end in all walks of life. This is the greatest fallacy of all times. This is true—because the end of segregation in all walks of life can mean only one thing—the amalgamation of all races. And surely God does not wish this to be done; surely, He does not want destroyed that which He has created; and surely—if we believe the Bible, we must believe that God created all races—He is the Creator of all things. (Col. 1:16)

The commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," should be observed by all, as well as all other commandments of God. But remember this:

This commandment does not command any man—at any time, or any where—to love his neighbor “More” than he does himself. And in no place in God’s word, does God command any man to love himself to the extent that he would commit racial suicide. Therefore, the “Gospel of love and human brotherhood” is not violated by racial segregation, because if God has not commanded man to love himself enough to commit racial suicide, then surely, God has not commanded man to love his brethren of another race to the extent that it would mean the amalgamation of the races—this would be racial suicide. And Negroes, themselves, have admitted that racial integration, will in the end, mean racial amalgamation.

The great majority of the white race do not love themselves, strongly enough, to destroy their own race. It is but natural for the men and women of the white race to want to see their own race perpetuated. Then—in view of these facts—must the people of the white race love their Negro neighbors with such zeal that the Negroes will be permitted to destroy the white race? This is unthinkable, because this would be loving our Negro neighbors more than we do ourselves; and this we are not commanded to do. We are commanded to love our neighbors, only as much, as we love ourselves. Therefore, the doctrine, that racial segregation violates the “Gospel of love and human brotherhood,” has no foundation.

The same God that gave the command: “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,” gave the command to keep the race pure by not inter-marrying with other races. Both these commands were given to the same people—the Jews. And this is direct proof from God Himself, that racial segregation does not violate His command: “thou shalt love thy neighbour as thy-

self." Because if God had considered that racial segregation violated the "Gospel of love and human brotherhood," then He never would have demanded racial purity of the Jews. Then if racial segregation did not violate the "Gospel of love and human brotherhood," where the Jews were concerned, then racial segregation does not violate the "Gospel of love and human brotherhood," where all other races are concerned. Because the Bible tells us that the laws that apply to Jews, likewise apply to all people. (See Ex. 12:49; Lev. 24:22; Num. 9:14; 15:15-16; Gal. 3:28)

Then if racial segregation was legal in the sight of God in the days of Moses, racial segregation violates no laws of God today, because Christ said: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." (Matt. 5:17).

But the National Council of Churches, many ministers, and others in the field of religion, are declaring that God demanded racial purity of the Jews, only for religious purposes—so that the religion of the Jews would not be defiled. But the reason, or for what purpose God demanded racial purity of the Jews, does not matter. The mere fact that segregation was demanded of the Jews, is self-evident proof that racial segregation violated no laws of God in the time of Moses; and if segregation did not violate any of the laws of God in the time of Moses, then segregation does not violate any laws of God today. So, racial segregation cannot be evil in the sight of God today.

I have mentioned this in another chapter, but now I want to address this, especially, to all people—in the field of religion—who are clamoring for racial integration in all the various walks of life. Will you stop and ponder in your minds—just for a little

while—what would have been the results, and the effects on the destiny of all mankind—only, if the Jews had mixed their blood with that of the Egyptians—to the extent that they had been amalgamated into one mongrel race—during their over 400 years' stay in Egypt?

I do not have all the answers to this question; but there is one thing that is a self-evident truth: Amalgamation of Jews and Egyptians—at this time—would have changed the whole course of history and the destiny of all mankind. In the first place, if the Jews and Egyptians had become one mongrel race, there would have been no Jews to have been led out of Egypt by Moses. But without any Jews there would have been no Moses; and without Moses, it would have been impossible for God to give Moses the Ten Commandments. And without any Jews, there could have been none of the prophets of the Old Testament, as we know them; and without any Jews, there would have been no Joseph or Mary unto whom Christ was born; and without any Jews, we could not now read about the works performed by the twelve disciples of Christ, as now recorded in the New Testament. And none of these things could have taken place—only, if the Jews and Egyptians had become amalgamated into a mongrel race. Why? Just because there would have been no Jews, and all these things were done by Jews.

What all the consequences would have been, if by amalgamation with the Egyptians, all Jews had become non-existent, I do not have all the answers; but one thing is a self-evident fact: The Bible that we have today could never have existed, because the whole Bible came by the way of the Jews.

Now, you ministers of the Gospel, others in the field of religion, and all others, who are demanding

the ending of all racial segregation in all the various walks of life, does this mean anything to you? Does not the possibility of racial mongrelization—mean anything to you—when it is obvious that the whole course of human events can be changed by it? God forbids it. Why don't you?

Now in view of the facts of the evil effects, as the results of racial mongrelization; and in view of the fact that the teachings of the Bible clearly prove that racial segregation is no violation of the commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," how do we account for so many ministers of the Gospel, and others in the field of religion, proclaiming to the world, that racial segregation does violate the "Gospel of love and human brotherhood"?

Two things have made this possible: the theory of evolution and Communism. Almost a hundred years ago the Communists were advised—by Karl Marx—to seek the overthrow of the government of these United States, from within the Nation, by infiltration of our various institutions. And this was made possible in the field of religion, by the teaching of evolution. And persons in the field of religion, and others, have been made to believe evolution as the means of creation, instead of creation by God as taught in the Bible, just simply because evolution has been taught freely in all our institutions of learning—while at the same time, creation by a Divine Power, as told in the Bible—has not been taught, as a subject, as has the subject of evolution, in the public institutions of learning—especially the colleges and universities of these United States. And because of this atheistic doctrine of evolution being permitted to be freely taught in these institutions, the Communists have been able, during the last hundred years, to do much toward molding the

minds of many of the young of this Nation, for the interest of Communism. On this, I will have more to say a little later. But just now, let us take a look to see a few things that the Communists are doing in the churches and religious organizations.

Earl Browder, while he was head of the Communist Party of the United States, made a speech to the students of Union Theological Seminary, in New York City, in which he said: "You may be interested in knowing that we have preachers, preachers active in churches, who are members of the Communist Party. There are churches in the United States where the preachers preach Communism from the pulpits, in a very primitive form, of course."

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, while testifying before the Congressional Committee on un-American Activities, concerning Communism in our churches, on March 26, 1947, said this: "I confess to a real apprehension so long as Communists are able to secure ministers of the Gospel to promote their evil work and espouse a cause that is alien to the religion of Christ and Judaism."

Then after long research, which required much work, the House Committee on un-American Activities, published a list of questions and answers on the activities of the Communists in the field of religion. From these, I quote the following:

Q: "Are Communists trying to corrupt religion in the U.S.A.?"

A: Yes.

Q: What is their method?

A: The Communist Party of the United States assigns members to join churches and church organizations, in order to take control where possible, and in

any case to influence thought and action toward Communist ends.

It forms "front organizations," designed to attract "fellow travelers" with religious interest.

It tries to get prominent religious leaders to support Communist policies, disguised as welfare work for minorities or oppressed groups. In the words of Earl Browder, former head of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.:

" . . . By going among the religious masses, we are for the first time able to bring our anti-religious ideas to them."

Q: What is a "front organization"?

A: An organization created or captured by the Communists to do the Party's work in special fields. The front organization is Communism's greatest weapon in this country and takes it among people who would never willingly act as Party agents.

Q: What is a "fellow traveler"?

A: One who sympathizes with the Party's aims and serves the Party's purposes without actually holding a Party card.

Q: Are American Communists atheistic?

A: Yes.

Q: How do Communists work among church people, since they themselves are such haters of religion?

A: Communists are two-faced.

In their secret Party meetings, they make plans to destroy religion.

In public, they say religion and Communism should be friends and that both are working for the same goals.

Q: Are there Communist clergymen?

A: Unfortunately, yes.

Q: Do they admit that they are Communists?

A: Some do, but except in special cases, the Party requires Communists to keep their membership secret.

Q: Is Communist propaganda ever sneaked into church publications?

A: Yes, For instance, the Christian Register, official Unitarian publication, has carried Earl Browder's eyewash that a good Christian can be a Communist. It is significant that the minister responsible for doing this has since been removed from his editorship by the church.

Q: Do Communist propagandists ever actually get before church groups as speakers?

A: Yes. For example, the head of the Communist Party, on one occasion at least spoke at Union Theological Seminary in New York City.

Only a few months ago, the Legislative Secretary of the Communist Party addressed a conference of 100 ministers in Washington, D. C.

Q: What about church youth groups?

A: Young Communists are ordered to join them.

Q: Why?

A: For two reasons: To win over youth to Communism and atheism, and to turn their groups into tools of the Communist Party.

Q: Is this done openly?

A: No. Communist youth, like Communist adults, work under cover. They won't admit being Communists if you ask them unless and until their Party directs them to do so.

Q: Is the YMCA a Communist target?

A: Yes. So is the YWCA.

Also, church groups such as the Epworth League.

Q: Do you mean every Epworth League or YWCA is a Communist hide-out?

A: Of course not. But we do mean that Commu-

nists do dig into such groups any way and any time they can.

We do mean they have dug into such groups, and are at it today.

We do mean that if you want to keep your own organization fit for your own family's membership, you had better stay on the alert.

Q: How else do Communists spread atheism?

A: Indirectly in Communist schools such as the Jefferson School of Social Science in New York, and in California Labor School.

Also in the atheistic schools for children operated throughout the country by the International Workers Order.

Q: What is the People's Institute of Applied Religion?

A: One of the most vicious Communist Organizations ever set up in this country. Declared subversive by the Attorney General.

Q: Where is it located and who are its officers?

A: 4105½ Third Avenue, South, Birmingham, Alabama.

Rev. Claude C. Williams, director; Edna Joyce King, executive secretary; Owen H. Whitfield and Winifred L. Chappell, associate directors; Carl Haessler, Calla E. Tennant, and Clara M. Vincent, trustees; Cedric Belfrage, research director.

Q: What does it do?

A: It teaches Communist ideas, pretending that they are Christian ideas.

Q: What is the Methodist Federation for Social Action?

A: A tool of the Communist Party, denounced by numerous loyal American Methodists. It claims to

speak for 17 Methodist Bishops and 4,000 clerics and laymen. Not an official church organization.

Q: Where is it located and what is it trying to do?

A: 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York. Although strictly unofficial as a "church organization," it is trying to use the prestige of the Methodist Church to promote the line of the Communist Party.

Q: What is the "*Protestant*"?

A: A magazine which fanatically spreads Communist propaganda under the guise of being a religious journal.

Its avowed purpose is to "Build a bridge" between Christendom and Communism. Boasts support of 6,000 ministers but not actually connected with any official religious organization.

Q: Where is it published and who are the officers?

A: It is published by Protestant Digest, Inc., at 521 5th Avenue, New York, New York. Editor: Kenneth Leslie; associate editors: James Luther Adams, John Hammond, Gerald Richardson."

Not long ago, an Air Force training manual came to light telling about the infiltration of the Communists into the churches of the United States. The *U.S. News and World Report* describes the incident like this:

"The publication spoke of 'overwhelming evidence' of the 'infiltration of fellow travelers into churches.' It mentioned the revised standard version of the Bible—a version sponsored by the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., which represents 33 Protestant and Orthodox denominations. Of 95 persons who worked on the Bible, the manual said, '30 have been affiliated with pro-Communist fronts . . . projects and publications.'

"The National Council called the statements 'absurd,' . . .

"But Chairman Francis E. Walter of the House Committee on un-American Activities said: 'The charges that were made are true.' Leaders of the American and International Councils of Christian Churches and the Church League of America also said the statements were true. Evangelist Billy James Hargis said in Tulsa, Okla., that he was the author of much of the controversial material, offered to conduct a public debate on the issue."

Now, there is much more information—reliable information—that could be given; but what I have given here should be sufficient to convince any person with an open mind that Communists are now working within the churches and religious organizations in these United States. And being atheist, it should be obvious to all that they are not in these places for the purpose of furthering the religion of those who believe in a living God. So, it must be as plain, as a nose on a face, that the Communists have worked their way into churches and religious organizations to further the cause of Communism. And there is no better way to help the cause of Communism in this nation, than by causing disunity among its people. And because "racial tension" is considered as being the Party's "most powerful weapon," to be used in the overthrow of the government of this Nation, is it not more than reasonable to believe that the Communists have infiltrated into the churches, and other fields of religion for the purpose of preaching a doctrine that will cause disunity among the different races of this Nation? Therefore, it is much more than a possibility that the Communists are the real force that is behind the push for racial integration.

Now, this Nation was founded upon the principle of Christianity and freedom of religion; and this Nation has always been known as a Christian Nation; and a hundred years ago, it would have been an impossibility for an atheistic organization—such as the Communist Party—to have infiltrated into the churches and religious organizations of this Nation, as it is today. Now, what has happened to bring all this about in such a short period of time? On this, I have already mentioned briefly what I thought was the cause, but now, let us look further into this matter.

The Communist Party is an organization of atheists. Therefore, without atheists, there could be no Communist Party. And a hundred years ago, atheists were almost as scarce in this Nation, and all Christendom, as hen's teeth. But all of a sudden, something happened—something happened that made it possible for atheism to take roots and grow and to multiply to the extent that today the whole world is threatened to be enslaved by atheism—better known as Communism.

Nothing can grow without a suitable soil, or surroundings, be it plants, animals, or theories. And now, Charles Darwin and Karl Marx were contemporaries; and while Marx was expounding his doctrine of Communism, Darwin, in 1859, published his works, "The Origin of Species." And up to this time—according to history—atheists were very, very scarce. But from this moment, until the present time, atheism has been on the increase throughout the entire world; and today, the atheistic doctrine of Communism is threatening to engulf all mankind.

H. G. Wells, the historian, on pages 988-89, of his work, "*Outline of History*," describes the effect of Darwinism on Christianity in these words: "Now, in all ages there have been sceptics in Christendom. Em-

peror Frederick II was certainly a sceptic; in the eighteenth century Gibbon and Voltaire were openly anti-Christian, and their writings influenced a number of scattered readers. But these were exceptional people. . . . Now the whole of Christendom became, as a whole, sceptical. . . .

"There was a real loss of faith after 1859. The true gold of religion was in many cases thrown away with the worn-out purse that had contained it so long, and it was not recovered."

Thus it should be readily seen that Darwinism—the theory of evolution—has been the major factor that has caused the increase of atheism throughout the world; and this in turn has made the increase of Communism possible. This is true, because, as Wells has told us, "Now the whole of Christendom became, as a whole, sceptical."

In other words, Wells tells us that the whole Christian world became doubtful of the power of God; and that this faith in the power of God has never been recovered. So, with this loss of faith in the power of God, it has been possible to convert many to the belief of atheism; and this in turn has made it possible to convert millions to Communism. Let me emphasize: Communism cannot exist without atheists to support it.

But you may ask: Why has not the Christian faith in the belief of Divine Creation been able to withstand the onslaughts of the atheistic doctrine of creation by evolution? The answer to this is simple:

For centuries there was no such thing as religious freedom throughout all Christendom. Who was persecuted, depended upon who was the stronger. And during all this period of religious persecution—most all education was under control of the church. But at

last a move got under way to give religious freedom to all faiths. And after a long time—what we call religious freedom—became a reality in most of the civilized world. But in fact, there is no such thing as religious freedom today. This is true—because, in most places—what we call religious freedom does not exist. In those places, religion—as is generally known—is not permitted to be taught in the public school systems. And this divorcing of the teaching—of what is most often called religion—in public schools, was thought to make religious freedom safe and secure for all religious faiths. But this is not so, because there is no religious freedom at the present time—throughout the world—for all people who believe in a living God. Now, you are going to dispute this before you know the truth, but the truth will set you right.

To begin with, let us see what is religion. But for our purpose here, it will not be necessary to go into all the aspects of what is religion. But briefly, if what I believe about a living God and His works, is my religion, then what the atheist does not believe about a living God and His works, is his religion—it cannot be anything else. Therefore, the only person—in the United States, and the world—who has religious freedom today, is the atheist. This is true, because the atheist is free to teach his atheistic doctrine of creation by evolution, in the public school systems the world over; while at the same time, those who believe in a living God are not permitted to teach in the public schools, scattered over the world, creation by a Divine Power as told in the Bible. That would be teaching religion, and that is not permitted. But you may say that we do have religious freedom, because all religious faiths are permitted to teach in their churches and private schools anything that they wish concerning

their religion. Yes, this is true; but the atheist—not only has the right to teach his religion, atheism, in his private schools—he has the right to teach his doctrine in the public schools. And in the public schools are where the minds of most of the young are molded. No, we do not have religious freedom in the United States, or elsewhere. And unless a great change is made, sooner or later, atheism in the form of Communism, will engulf the world; and then the worship of a living God will be forbidden. We know that this is true, because all we have to do is to take a look as to what is going on in the Communist Nations at the present time. Although religious worship is tolerated to a certain extent, we have definite proof—in spite of the claims of the Communists to the contrary—that there is no real religious freedom in any of the Communist Nations; and neither is there freedom of any kind.

It is an old saying: "One extreme follows another." So it follows, that after the church for centuries, having had charge of all education, then in most nations of the Christian World, the church was separated from all public education; and the religion of all faiths, who believed in a living God, has been prohibited from being taught in these public institutions. But all the while, the religion of the atheist, has been freely taught in these public institutions. So, it should be obvious that we do not have religious freedom for any one, except those who do not believe in a living God. So, the question arises: what should we do that we may have religious freedom? The answer is simple: Forbid the teaching of the atheist doctrine of creation by evolution, in the public schools, just like we have prohibited the teaching of all other religious faiths in public schools. And if we will do this, then we will have religious freedom for all—religious freedom

for those who believe in a living God—as well as religious freedom for those who do not believe in a living God.

Now, do not get me wrong, because I do believe in freedom—freedom of thought as well as other things. So, I would not suppress the teaching of creation by evolution, except in the public schools. This I would do, because the belief that all things have been created by the means of evolution, is the religion of the atheist. It is his belief—it is his faith—his faith in what he believes God has not done. In principle, there is no difference in this, than there is where a man believes in creation by God, as told in the Bible. Because both are based on faith. One believes that all things were created by a living God; while the other believes that all things were created by evolution, which means that all things came into being by chance, or accident. Now, on the one hand, we have those who believe that God created all things; and this is what they believe that God has done. While on the other hand, we have those who believe that all things were created by evolution; and this is what they believe what God has not done; but the principle is the same in both cases. Therefore, if we are to have religious freedom, either both of these beliefs, or faiths, must be taught in the public schools, or neither one. Because both sides of any issue must be equally heard, before an impartial verdict can be rendered. And in this Nation, and elsewhere, the young—the future leaders of this Nation and the world—in the public schools, these young people have only been hearing one side of the story of creation; that is, creation by evolution. So, in view of these facts, is there any wonder that the whole world is threatened to be enslaved by atheism—better known as Communism?

And right now, racial freedom—the freedom that would give each of the races of mankind the right to perpetuate its own race, without hindrance from any other race, or races—is threatened to be destroyed, here in these United States. And all this has been made possible—all because the atheistic doctrine of creation by evolution has been freely taught in the public schools of this Nation; while at the same time, creation by a Supreme Being, has been prohibited from being taught in these schools. And because of this one-sided teaching of a great doctrine—the doctrine of creation—many of the people of this Nation have lost their faith in the power of God. And as a result of this, a great number of people of this Nation—including many in the field of religion—are proclaiming that evolution, and not God, was the creator of the different races of mankind. And those who believe this, have no racial pride—be they white or black—because they believe they are what they are because of chance, or accident; and this minimizes the importance of race, in the minds of those who believe that the races came into being by some unknown natural process. To these people the amalgamation of the races mean nothing. And if these people did not exist, there would be no clamoring for the ending of racial segregation today. Because if all men believed that God created all things—including all races of mankind—then any man, white or black, would feel that the race that he belonged to was important. He would feel that it was so important that he would not want it to be mixed with any other race. This he would believe, because he would think that God had a good and particular reason for making him what he was. And because of this, he would not think that racial segregation is racial discrimination. Therefore,

it should be obvious that if those who are now crying for racial integration, believed that God was the Creator of all things, there would be no racial trouble in this Land of Ours right now. But such is not the case; and the reason for this condition is this:

For a hundred years now, God has been on trial, being accused of not being the Creator of all things—including man and the races of man. And this trial has been taking place, mostly, in the public schools. Here, the accusers, the atheists, are permitted to present their unproven evidence against God to the jury—which in this case are the students of the public schools. But in this case, God has no one to represent Him; and He is not permitted to put His witness—the Bible—upon the stand to testify in His defense. And without a witness to speak in His behalf, God has not had much of a chance to prove Himself innocent. So, in view of this, there is no wonder that so many of the jurors—the past and present students of the public schools, especially those of the colleges and universities—have voted to find God guilty as charged. And because of this, it is not difficult to see why the whole world is threatened to be enslaved by atheism—better known as Communism; and it should be obvious, that because of this, the white race, right now, is in danger of losing its racial freedom—the freedom that is so necessary, if there is to be a white race a thousand years from now.

But there is something that I want to get straight: Every person, who believes in creation by evolution, is not an outright atheist. But in this group will be found the doubters of the power of God; and from these unbelievers in the power of God, the 100 percent atheists, or Communists—whichever one you want to call them—recruit their fellow travelers and the heads of their

front organizations from. And in this group, you will find the ministers of the Gospels, and others in the field of religion, who are proclaiming that it is possible that it was God's plan to create all things by the process of evolution; and in this same crowd, will be found those who are howling for the ending of racial segregation. And these must be the ones that Paul spoke of—who would, in the last days, have “a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away,” Paul declared. (See II Tim. 3:5).

In 1859, Darwin published his book, “*The Origin of Species*,” and since that time, faith in the power of God has steadily declined. This H. G. Wells, the historian—whom I have already mentioned—tells us about it in his work, “*Outline of History*.” In commenting upon how Darwinism had affected the Christian world, Wells said:

“Now, in all ages there have been sceptics in Christendom. The Emperor Frederick II was certainly a sceptic; in the eighteenth century Gibbon and Voltaire were openly anti-Christian, and their writings influenced a number of scattered readers. But these were exceptional people. . . . Now the whole of Christendom became, as a whole, sceptical. . . .

“There was a real loss of faith after 1859. The true gold of religion was in many cases thrown away with the worn-out purse that had contained it for so long, and it was not recovered.”

I have repeated this quotation, because I wanted to emphasize that it is a historical fact that after Darwin published his works, “*The Origin of Species*,” faith in God and His works has declined. And there can be no doubt but that the teaching of Darwin's atheistic doctrine of evolution has been the major factor that has caused the alarming increase in the belief in atheism

during the past one hundred years. And I want to emphasize that without this enormous increase in the number of atheists, the world today would not be threatened with Communism, because all Communists are atheists. So, it follows that there cannot be an increase of Communists, without a comparable increase in atheists. And the teaching of Darwinism has made this increase of atheists possible.

And let me emphasize this: If it had not been for the loss of faith in the power of God during the past century, there would be no racial problem in these United States today.

CHAPTER VI

FORCED INTEGRATION IS SLAVERY

Whenever, or however, any person or persons are forced to do a job, or a service for others—call it what you may—that is slavery.

The Negroes of this Nation have a job that they want done—a job that they cannot do by themselves. They must have the help of the white race, otherwise, the job cannot be done. This job calls for close association between whites and Negroes—without close association between the races, it can never be done. That this job may be finished in the shortest possible time, the Negro is putting his every effort into it.

To obtain the needed and necessary help from the white race to get this job done, the Negro is using a most powerful weapon—the weapon of deception. While pretending that equal rights in the field of education and other walks of life, is all that he is after, the truth of the matter is that this is only a hoax to force the races to associate together. The Negro knows and all other thinking people know—that if the races can be forced to associate together—especially while they are young—inter-racial marriage will come about, sooner or later; and it will be sooner than most people think.

Inter-racial marriage is the important step toward the final goal of the Negro. The ultimate goal being the mongrelization of the races. With the races mongrelized, there will be no Negroes. Mongrelization of the races—that is the job Negroes want done.

This is the job the white race must help the Negro with, otherwise, it can never be done.

Now, the great majority of the white people of this Nation wish to see Negroes have equal rights with themselves; but there are not many white people that want to see the white and Negro races become a mongrel race. But the white race is being forced to do the things that will result in the amalgamation of the races into one mongrel race.

The majority of the white race do not want the races mongrelized; but a large segment of the Negro race wants it; and the Supreme Court has said in effect, that the white race must do the very things that will lead to mongrelization of the races. This is a service forced from the white race for the benefit of the Negro race. A service forced from one person, or persons for the benefit of others is slavery, no matter under what disguise this service is performed—it cannot be anything else.

The Civil War and the thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution, abolished legal slavery in this Nation. But on May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of these United States made slavery legal again—yes, legal once more right here in this Nation—in the Nation, known as the “land of the free and the home of the brave.”

The Supreme Court's school and other desegregation decisions are forcing the white people of this Nation to associate with the Negro race. Close association with each other—especially while young—is all that is necessary to mongrelize the races. Therefore, this forced association with the Negro race, is a forced service, performed by the white race for the benefit of the Negro race. This is legal slavery all over again.

But some are saying that this forced association of Negroes and whites, with each other, in schools and other places, is nothing more than compelling the white race to give equal rights and equal opportunities to Negroes—rights that the Constitution guarantees to Negroes. But nothing could be farther from the truth than this. Because there is nothing in the Constitution that gives the Negro race the legal right to force the white race to do the things that will destroy the white race. Forced association with each other will do this. So, no matter from what angle you look at it, forced racial integration is slavery.

But there may be some who will contend that Negroes are justified in wanting to mongrelize the races. That the mere fact of being Negroes, has caused them to be discriminated against in all walks of life. Therefore, they argue, it is nothing but natural, or human nature, for the Negroes to wish to lose their identity as Negroes by the process of amalgamation, thereby making discrimination impossible because of race. But this can have no bearing on the subject: that forced racial integration is slavery.

It never has been a question as to why any people want jobs, or services done that makes slavery a reality. It was not a question, as to why the South wanted Negroes to do jobs and services that made slavery a reality in the South. No, the why, or the reason any people want to force others to perform services for them, cannot be considered, when the question of slavery is under consideration. The fact that Negroes were forced to perform services for the people of the South was proof that slavery existed in the South. The reason why it existed, had nothing to do with it.

Likewise, the why, or the reason the Negroes of this Nation want the races mongrelized, can have no

bearing, one way or another, whether or not forced racial integration is slavery. The one thing, and the important thing that counts, is that the white race is being forced to associate with Negroes. This is a forced service; this will mongrelize the races; therefore, this can be nothing but slavery. Yes, the Supreme Court has made slavery a legal institution in this Nation, once more.

CHAPTER VII

THE SCHOOL DESEGREGATION DECISION
IS BASELESS

The School Desegregation Decision of May 17, 1954 has no foundation upon which to stand. The Constitution of the United States does not support it; neither does the psychological reasoning, upon which the decision was made, sustain it in the least.

That you may be better able to understand what I have to say concerning this decision, I quote the following from the decision:

"We come now to the question presented: Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other tangible factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We say that it does . . .

"To separate them from others of similar age and other qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. The effect of this separation on their educational opportunities was well stated by a finding in the Kansas case by a court which nevertheless felt compelled to rule against the Negro plaintiff:

" 'Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of law: for the policy of separating the races is

usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to retard the education and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racially integrated school system.'

"Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy V. Ferguson*, this finding is amply supported by modern authority. Any language in *Plessy V. Ferguson* contrary to this finding is rejected.

"We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiff and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought will, by reason of the segregation complained of, be deprived of equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment."

Thus it can be seen that the School desegregation decision was based solely upon the assumption that to separate the races because of color, "generates a feeling of inferiority" in the Negro children; that this alleged feeling of inferiority affected the ability of Negro children to learn; and because it affected their ability to learn, segregation was detrimental to Negro children. Therefore, segregation "deprived" Negro children "of equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment."

For what it called its modern authority, the Supreme Court cited a group of psychologists. Several of these have been investigated by the House Committee on Un-American activities; and have been cited as being members of many organizations declared by the De-

partment of Justice to be Communistic or Communist dominated. For its chief authority, the Court said: "And see generally Myrdal, *An American Dilemma* 1944."

This Myrdal is the same man that I have previously called your attention to who has declared that the Constitution of the United States was "impractical and unsuited to modern conditions" and that its adoption was "nearly a plot against the common people." Also, this is the same man who said that there is a conflict in these United States between liberty and equality; and that in this conflict, "equality is slowly winning," and that "when there is substantial discrimination present, liberty for the white person has to be overruled by equality."

In this last statement, Myrdal was discussing racial segregation, and social equality between Negroes and whites. So, in substance, Myrdal has said that in order for the Negro to have social equality, liberty for the white race must be destroyed. With its forced racial association, this is what school desegregation will do. This is what I have been trying to tell you: that forced race mixing will destroy the liberty of the white race—that forced race mixing is slavery.

But in spite of this, the Supreme Court used the writings of Myrdal, mostly, for what the Court called "modern authority" for its authority in the School Desegregation decision.

To think that the Supreme Court would even think of considering a man like Myrdal who has shown the utmost contempt—not only for the Constitution of the United States—but for the liberty of the white race, is preposterous—it just does not make sense.

Myrdal's thinking is most dangerous. Because where there is liberty, there can be no conflict between liberty

and equality. As I have pointed out in another chapter, there can only be equal rights, or equality, where all concerned own, or have equal legitimate interest. No man has equal rights in a home that is owned entirely by another man. Likewise, by no stretch of the imagination can there ever be social equality between the Negro and white race. Why? Because the white race owns everything—all its racial characteristics—that makes the white race what it is. To force the white race to allow the Negro race to come into the white race and make itself at home—mix and mingle in all walks of life—would be like forcing a person to permit another person to come into his own home, with equal rights, without any reservations. In both cases, liberty would be destroyed—liberty of the whole white race on the one hand; and individual personal liberty on the other hand. But in each case, the principle is the same.

As we have already seen, the School Desegregation decision was based on the theory that to segregate children because of race, "generates a feeling of inferiority" in Negro children; and that this feeling of inferiority affected the ability of Negro children to learn. Therefore, the Court declared, segregation of the races in schools, deprived the Negro children the "equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment."

The Court offered no proof to prove that the feeling of inferiority affected the ability of Negro children to learn. This was merely the opinion of the Court, sustained, only, by a group of psychologists, such as Myrdal, whose opinions are worthless, except to the cause of Communism. So, the question arises: does the feeling of inferiority affect the ability of Negro children to learn; or is it detrimental to them in any

manner? Unless the feeling of inferiority is detrimental to Negro children as alleged by the Supreme Court, the School Desegregation decision is baseless. So, let us look into this phase of the case that we may determine the facts, whatever, they may be.

It is a known fact that Communists are in our schools, colleges, universities, theological seminaries, and even our churches. They are in these institutions for only one purpose: to deceive and destroy us. To deceive us, they are teaching our young girls and boys unproven theories for facts, and things that are false for the truth. We go to school to learn, so when we grow up, we are, mostly, what we have been taught. Therefore, deception in our institutions of learning, is one of the Communists' most powerful weapons.

In view of all of this, is it not more than reasonable to believe that the Communists would not pass up the field of psychology for one of their master pieces of deception? No, in the field of psychology—the science of the mind—the Communists would never ignore. In this field, the Communists carry on their greatest work of deception. It is in this field that the minds of men and women are warped; and it is in this field that the greatest deception concerning race relations between Negroes and whites has been carried on.

The very fact that several of the psychologists named by the Supreme Court as "modern authority" have been investigated by the House Committee on Un-American activities and were cited as being members of many organizations which have been declared by the Department of Justice to be Communistic or Communist dominated, is proof that the Communists have infiltrated into the field of psychology. Also, the very nature of the reasoning by the Supreme Court in the School Desegregation decision, points a suspecting

finger toward the Communists as being the originator of such thinking. Why? Because the reasoning put forth in that case is contrary to known facts.

The feeling of inferiority is a natural thing—almost as natural as life itself. Why? Because, in all this world, there is no such thing as any thing being superior, in all respects, to all other things of a similar kind. This is true, regardless of whether it is a person, a racial group, or any of the many thousands of God's other creatures, or a man made article. If it was possible to bring together the two persons, in this whole world, that were the exact opposite to each other—one the most intelligent and the most highly educated; the other—the most ignorant and most unlearned—it would be found, that in some respects, the most intelligent would be inferior to the most ignorant. No one is so smart, that he cannot learn something from the most ignorant. The person who has failed to learn this, has failed to learn a valuable lesson. Yes, the feeling of inferiority is a natural thing.

Inferiority seeks compensation. This is true in all nature, as well as everything else.

A heart that has a leaking valve, compensates for the deficiency by enlarging; a blind person's sense of touch and hearing become much more sensitive; the loss of an arm, results in the other arm becoming stronger; and a deaf person's sense of observation is keener. On and on, it goes—in all nature—wherever there is a deficiency, there is a compensation. Likewise, the same is true among people.

Whenever a man has a sense of feeling inferior—right then, he seeks a remedy—he looks around for ways to overcome his inferiority. Because it is not the desire of any man to be inferior to others; but to be superior. So, when a person sees and realizes that

he has a deficiency, it becomes an asset to him instead of a liability. It becomes the incentive or driving force that spurs a person on to do all the things that he is capable of doing. This is true in the entire field of human endeavor, regardless of the reason, or cause for the feeling of inferiority.

Thus only was it that Demosthenes, the man with weak lungs and a stammering voice, after great effort, was able to become the greatest orator of the ancient world, and one of the greatest of all times; that the deaf Beethoven became the most famous of all musicians, doing his best work after becoming totally deaf. Only the desire to become superior in spite of deficiencies was this possible.

Many are the barefoot boys who were born in poverty who have become famous in spite of their inferior station in life. Abraham Lincoln was such a boy. No person has ever had a more lowly beginning—then reached such heights as he—the Presidency of the United States.

No one could have felt more lowly than Benjamin Franklin, as he trudged down the streets of Philadelphia on that Sunday morning with a loaf of bread under each arm, while eating another; yet, he became rich and one of the most famous men of these United States.

Booker T. Washington, the great Negro educator, who was born a slave, could never have reached the heights he did, if the feeling of a sense of inferiority had produced a detrimental effect upon him. No, the feeling of inferiority did not prevent Booker T. Washington from getting an education; it was the force that drove him ever forward.

There is no doubt but that there are many things that make Negroes—the Negro race as a whole—feel

inferior to the white race. Indeed, there must be many things that have made the Negro race feel far more inferior than have segregated schools.

When Negroes look through the pages of history and survey the accomplishments of mankind, they must be made to feel inferior. Because through all the pages of history, there are no great achievements by the Negro race recorded. Recorded nowhere in history, is one great civilization, built by Negroes; and of all the great names of history, none are Negroes. Not one Negro name is recorded that can be compared to Alexander the Great, Demosthenes, Napoleon, John Milton, John Bunyan, Shakespeare, George Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and many more, too numerous to mention.

In all fields of endeavor, no race has accomplished so little, as the Negro race. There are no great National heroes within the Negro race; none of the great inventions have been made by Negroes; and the Negro race in its native land, Africa, has made but little progress during all the time of recorded history.

So, when Negroes look through the pages of history and see how little the Negro race has done toward making the world a better place in which to live, they must feel inferior—there is no other possibility. And this is the one case where the Supreme Court cannot by a decree, remove the factors that are responsible for the feeling of inferiority. To do so, all the records of history would have to be destroyed. This would be a major task—an impossibility. But probably the Supreme Court will undertake to do this very thing. Because if racial segregation in schools makes Negro children feel inferior, and this affects their ability to learn; then there is every reason to believe that a feeling of inferiority—which must exist in all Negroes

because of the past record of no major achievements by the Negro race—must also affect the ability of all Negroes to learn in all fields of learning in all walks of life. Thus, it would seem that if we must remove all factors that cause the Negro race to feel inferior before Negroes are able to get an education, Negroes, as a whole, are doomed to live in ignorance.

So, it is not a question, whether or not, Negroes feel inferior—they cannot feel otherwise, but the question is: is the feeling of inferiority detrimental to Negroes? In other words, would Negroes be able to learn better, or make more progress in all the various walks of life, if this sense of inferiority could be erased from their minds forever? Proven facts say no.

A sense of inferiority is the driving force that makes men do, seemingly, the impossible; without it, the wheels of progress would grind to a stop; without it no man ever accomplishes all that he is capable of doing; and without it, no concern will ever produce the best article that it is capable of producing.

But the feeling of inferiority can never become an asset until it is realized that it exists. But once a person becomes aware that there is something that concerns himself that makes him feel inferior to others, then that person begins to seek ways by which he will try to convince the world that the bottom is not the place where he belongs. No man will long remain on bottom—at least without a desperate try—once he realizes that others are on top of him, unless he is actually inferior. But by perseverance inferiors often surpass their superiors.

Nothing will make a boy feel more inferior than being physically handicapped. Any boy that is a physical weakling is at the mercy of all the bullies. To be able to retaliate against these bullies is the desire of all

physical weaklings. In one way or another, many times, they succeed.

Charles Atlas was such a boy. Being a runt and a weakling, he was pushed around by all bullies. But Charles was not satisfied to be pushed around for always. Being a weakling, he must become strong. This was a difficult task for a boy at sixteen, and only weighing 97 pounds. But Atlas would not be dismayed. He trained long and hard. His friends laughed at him for his efforts, but nothing stopped him, and at last, he became known as "the world's most perfectly developed man." It is reasonable to believe that Charles Atlas would never have become such a man, if he had been physically normal when he was a boy. The feeling of inferiority was the making of Charles Atlas.

Isaac Newton was almost a failure in school. But one day something happened that changed this—changed Newton from a failure to a success. There was a bully in the school that Newton was attending—a bully, both physically and in the class room. One day this bully pounded Newton with a punch that shocked Newton into his senses. Newton decided that in some way he was going to show this bully that he was not the superior—at least not in all things. Physically, there was nothing that Newton could do—in this field, the bully was superior. But in the classroom, it was a different story—it was here that Newton proved that he was not inferior to anyone; and it was here that Newton proved to the world that the feeling of inferiority is the force that makes a person realize that if he is not to be an inferior, then he must put forth his every effort.

Here the feeling of inferiority was the spark that set to work one of the greatest minds of all times. Once started, it never stopped. The results: "Isaac Newton

became one of the greatest mathematicians and philosophers that the world has ever produced." Proving once again, that the feeling of inferiority is most often the force behind the scene—the force that somehow persuades men to do their utmost.

Sometimes, men who have made a success in a certain business, become satisfied with the business as it is. Most often in cases of this kind, there is not much competition; and the concern is making money. Where there is not much competition, there cannot be much concern over having an inferior product. So, without strong competition, there is no incentive for a concern to make improvements; complacency becomes the order of the day; and then progress in that concern slows down. The Ford Motor Company is a good example of such a concern.

Henry Ford built the model T Automobile. This was a practical car, low in price, and serving the needs of the day. Being low in price, it was in reach of the pocket book of the common man. This made it in great demand. From the sale of the model T, Ford became rich and famous. But for many years, the model T did not have much competition. So, in the field of low priced cars, Ford had almost full sway. And during all the years of practically no competition, Ford made little change, or improvement in the model T. Basically, the car remained the same. As far as Ford was concerned, there was no need to make a better car. The model T was selling and making him money—this was enough for Ford.

But at last, other companies began to make cars in the low price field that were in many respects superior to the model T. This was like a punch on the nose; and it woke Ford up to the realization that he was no longer the czar in the field of low priced automobiles.

This made Ford realize that if he was going to stay in the automobile business, then he must make a better car than the model T. Ford did something—he built a better car. But would he have built a better car, if others had not built better cars first?

Yes, it is possible, that if Ford had not been made to feel inferior in the automobile field—made to realize that others were making better cars—cars that were superior to the model T, that the Ford car of today would be nothing more than another improved model T.

All this adds up to one thing: that whenever or wherever there is a sense of inferiority, and is realized, in that place, progress is made; but whenever or wherever there is little or no sense of inferiority, in that place, there is little or no progress. Yes, a sense of inferiority persuades men to do their utmost, most times, when everything else fails.

In all walks of life, the story is the same. You—no matter who you are; no matter what your profession is; no matter what is your station in life—you will try to prove to the world, if you have a feeling of inferiority—that you are not inferior to your fellow citizens. Because of this, the world is better off. It is the spark that keeps in motion the wheels of progress. The manufacturer produces a better product because his competitor produces a better product; the farmer grows a better field of corn, because his neighbor has grown better corn; the athlete plays a better game, because someone else has played a better game; and in the field of learning—as I have already pointed out—the greatest men, of all ages, have become great because of a sense of inferiority. But let me emphasize once more, that a feeling of inferiority must be rea-

lized, before it can become an asset; but once it is realized, it is the spark that sets in motion the desire, and ambition to overcome that deficiency—yes, without it, there would be no progress.

The Negro race can be no exception to this. In their native land, Negroes for thousands of years lived a simple life; their needs were few; they produced no great leaders; all living the same simple life, there was nothing to make any feel inferior to any others; being isolated from all other races, it was impossible for them to feel inferior to other races; therefore, lacking this sense of inferiority, the Negro race for thousands of years made but little or no progress. Only in recent times have Negroes in their native land showed signs of wanting to improve their condition. This can only be accounted for by Negroes beginning to realize how little the Negro race has done, compared with the accomplishments of other races—this must make Negroes feel inferior. But since these Negroes have begun to have a sense of inferiority, they are slowly but surely beginning to take steps to convince the world that they are not inferior to other races.

Negroes here in the United States furnish us with more than ample proof that the feeling of inferiority is an asset to the Negro race, and not a liability.

In this Nation, there are two things that cannot be obliterated, that will always stare all Negroes in the face, either or both are compelled to make all Negroes have a sense of inferiority. First, the blank record of achievements in their native land, can do nothing but make Negroes have a feeling of inferiority. Second, the mere fact that the white race was able to hold Negroes in this Nation in slavery—forcing them to perform all kinds of services for the white race—this

alone, would be enough to make the Negro race have a feeling of inferiority. Because, no man can feel equal, physically, to any other man who can and does rub his nose in the sand—this will make any man feel little. Likewise, it is impossible for the Negro race to feel equal to the white race. Because, figuratively speaking, the white race has rubbed the nose of the Negro race in the sand, not only in this Nation, but throughout the world, by forcing the Negro race to do the menial labor of the white race—this can do nothing but make the Negro race feel little.

As already stated, when once realized, the feeling of inferiority in a person is the spark that sets in motion the desire and ambition that make men seek compensation for their deficiencies—making them to search for means by which this may be accomplished.

So, when freed from slavery almost a hundred years ago, Negroes having a sense of inferiority, and realizing what it meant, began to look around for a remedy—they wanted to do something so that the feeling of inferiority might be erased from their minds. To this end, the Negroes of this Nation went to work—they have done much. In no other place in the world, have Negroes done so much in such a short time. Here in these United States, Negroes have reached heights in many fields of learning, and elsewhere, unknown in any other place in the world.

For this great progress of the Negro race, there must be a reason—things just do not happen by mere accident, without a cause, especially is this true of the Negro race—when we must realize that the potential abilities of the Negro race remained dormant for thousands of years. The most logical reason for this great achievement of the Negro race, is the feeling of inferiority within the Negro race. Because, as we have

already seen, this is the force that moves men to do, seemingly, the impossible—the force that gets things done, when everything else fails.

There can be no doubt but that racial segregation has played a major part in the great progress that the Negro race has made in this Nation. Being segregated in most walks of life, and not being accepted in the homes of the white race as social equals, has no doubt, made Negroes feel more inferior than they would otherwise. We have proof that this has acted as an extra incentive in this Nation; and that it has been one of the driving forces that has spurred the Negro race on to greater achievements.

In all the countries of South America, there is no racial segregation. Here we find classes, but they are not based on race or color. They are based on economical factors. The rich, regardless of race, or color, being in the highest class; the middle class, being in the middle bracket of the economical scale; and the lowest class, being in the lowest bracket of the economical scale. And there is no prejudice against inter-racial marriages, thereby making it possible for Negroes to marry, within their class, their choice, within the white race.

All this adds up to this: Negroes in South America are more satisfied with their station in life than they are in these United States. This is so, because here, they have already reached the chief goal of the Negro race—social equality with the white race that carries the privilege of marrying within the white race. This makes the Negroes of South America complacent, because they have already reached their most cherished goal; so, they do not have that desire and ambition that is so necessary if much progress is made; and we find that in all the South American countries, Negroes

are making little progress, as compared to what they are doing in the United States.

In speaking of the progress of Negroes in Brazil, Donald Pierson, on page 349 of his book, "*Negroes in Brazil*," said this:

"It is possible that the Brazilian blacks and mixed-bloods, lacking as they do in most cases the sense of inferiority long characteristic of the Negro in the United States, particularly of the mixed-blood, have been less activated by personal ambition. Feeling themselves less under the necessity of demonstrating to a hostile white world their individual talents and abilities, they have not had the same incentive for social advancement and, consequently, have not, perhaps, as a group, risen in class as has the Negro in the United States."

Thus it is: Wherever Negroes are not segregated and accepted as social equals, the achievements of Negroes are less than in countries where segregation exists, such as the United States. This is a fact and not a theory. Therefore, surely, the feeling of inferiority is the force that is ever driving Negroes on to more and greater progress.

But Negroes here in the United States are not satisfied with the progress that they are making. This is true because of one thing: Progress of the Negro race does not remove the chief cause for the feeling of inferiority within the Negro race; and whenever there is a feeling of inferiority in any man, or a group of men, there is always a natural desire to have the cause for this removed. And as we have already seen, the Negro race—*itself*—is the main cause for the feeling of inferiority within the Negro race. The Negro race has been the "Do-nothing" race down through the ages. The record of this is always staring all Negroes

in the face. So, if the chief cause for the feeling of inferiority within the Negro race is removed, the whole Negro race must be obliterated. This is the goal of the Negro race; and that it may be accomplished, Negroes are exerting their every effort to force the white race to associate with them, knowing that this will in the end get the job done. This is what is taking place in all countries where Negroes and whites associate together socially.

But in spite of all the vast amount of proof that is at our command, that the feeling of inferiority is the force behind the scene that puts the zeal and ambition in men that causes them to do their utmost; and the compelling proof that we have that amalgamation of the races, is the final goal of the Negro race, the Supreme Court, in its desegregation decisions, has said, in effect, that the white race must associate with the Negro race; and, undoubtedly, knowing at the time, that close inter-racial association would in the end bring about racial amalgamation. It just does not make sense.

Based upon the fact that the feeling of inferiority is the force that spurs men on to greater effort with the problems of life than they would otherwise, it must be obvious to anyone who has given it serious thought, that racial segregation in schools and elsewhere, cannot have a detrimental effect upon Negroes. Therefore, the School Desegregation decision of May 17, 1954, being based, solely, upon the assumption that racial segregation in schools, "generates a feeling of inferiority" in Negro children; and "a sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn," we must conclude that this decision is baseless—being not grounded upon the Constitution of this Nation, and being contrary to proven psychological facts.

CHAPTER VIII

THE REMEDY—AND WHAT WE CAN DO

The solution to the whole racial issue can be summed up in two words—racial freedom. The freedom of race—the freedom that will guarantee to all races, that each individual race shall have the right not to be forced to associate with any other race—at any time, in any place—in schools or elsewhere.

Only upon this basis can the racial problems that confront us be solved. Because, only with racial freedom, is it possible for all the different races of mankind to be perpetuated; and if man has any God given rights, then surely, the right to perpetuate his own race is one of them. And the great majority of the white race would like to have a guarantee that a few thousand years from now, there will still be a white race—a white race that can look back through the centuries—as we can today, and say with pride, my race—the white race—did this great achievement and it did that one. Some Negroes would like to have this same guarantee. But without racial freedom, this is not possible; and without racial freedom, all that can be, will be a mongrel race, without racial pride, and no great achievements. Look the world over today and we find this: That wherever the majority of the population of any country is composed of mixed-bloods of diverse races, the people of that country have no racial pride; and in all such countries, progress is slow, making such countries backward when compared with other countries where the majority of the populations

are of unmixed-bloods of diverse races. There is not a single exception to this; and I challenge the world to prove otherwise.

Yes, give us racial freedom; then all other racial problems can be solved, and solved easily and without trouble. For instance, if we had racial freedom, the South would not object to all qualified Negroes voting. But self preservation is the first law of nature, so with Negroes demanding that Southern whites be forced to associate with them in schools and in other walks of life, it is but natural that we use every legal means possible to prevent this.

Let the Negro race recognize that the white race is entitled to racial freedom; and then let this be guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, then the two races can live together in peace, under the same government; and then, both races can work together for the mutual benefit of both races—in all things, except purely social. But without racial freedom, there will never be peace between the two races, so long as there is a Negro and a white race. This is true, because men, usually, do not give equal rights to others—except where some kind of trickery has been played—to things that belong solely to themselves. And as I have already pointed out, all the things—the racial characteristics—that make the white race what it is, belong to the white race; and all the things—the racial characteristics—that make the Negro race what it is, belong to the Negro race. Therefore, the forced association of whites with Negroes in schools and other places can do nothing but destroy the liberty of the white race.

But Negroes and many whites deny this. They contend that in all matters that are purely social, that this is an individual matter between individual members

of the two races—that if a Negro and a white person wish to get married—that is nobody's business, except those two. But this is one of the greatest deceptions of all times. Why so many white people have fallen for it is a mystery. It is like this:

When any man does anything that affects only himself, then this is an individual matter; but when a man does something that affects both himself and others, then it becomes more than an individual matter—it becomes a matter that concerns both the individual that did the act, and all others that the act affects. This is why the marriage between a Negro and a white person concerns more than just these two individuals.

The white race is an individual race; and the Negro race is another individual race. So, when two members of the white race marry each other, this is purely an individual matter—both from an individual personal standpoint, and, also, from an individual racial standpoint. In a marriage like this where both parties belong to the same race, it cannot in any way help to bring about the destruction of that or any other race. Therefore, when two members of the same race, of any race, marry, then that is nothing but an individual matter.

But when two persons marry that belong to different races, it becomes much more than an individual matter—it is much more than an individual personal matter; and it is much more than an individual racial matter. Because a mixed marriage, such as between a Negro and a white person, not only concerns the parties to the marriage, but it concerns both the white and Negro races, including every member of each race. This is true, because such mixed marriages, in the end, will destroy both races. This is what most Negroes want; but most members of the white race of

this Nation do not want the white race obliterated. So, every mixed marriage between a white person and a Negro, affects every member of the white race—it is one more step toward the mongrelization of the races.

Then to say that a mixed marriage between a white person and a Negro, is just a personal matter between the two parties—well—it just does not make sense. Because whatever you belong to, that gives you a legitimate interest in that thing; and where you have a legitimate interest, you have a legitimate right. Now, every white person in this Nation is a member of the white race. This gives every white person in this Nation a legitimate interest in the white race; and with this legitimate interest, every member of the white race of this Nation has a legitimate right in the white race—a right to a voice in everything that affects the race as a whole. Every mixed marriage between a white person and a Negro affects the white race as a whole—enough such marriages will destroy it. So, in view of this, it is clear that every white person of this Nation has the legitimate right to say, whether or not, whites and Negroes in this Nation should be permitted to marry. Yes, marriages between whites and Negroes is much more than an individual personal matter. It is a matter for the whole white race.

No, we do not have racial freedom in this Nation; and we cannot have it, so long as the Supreme Court's School and other desegregation decisions remain the so-called law of the Land. This is true, because our associates and what we have been taught, especially, while we are young, determine, mostly, what we are. So, the destiny of all persons lies in the hands of those who mold their minds while they are young. This is no new theory; it is a fact that has been known all down through the ages.

That old maxim in Proverbs 22:6, "Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it," is well known to the forces that are demanding racial integration in the various walks of life in this Nation. These forces, not only know about this old proverb, but they are making use of it—not to train a child in the way he should be trained—but in the way that will further the cause of racial mongrelization. Far too many men and women of the white race fail to realize the importance of this old maxim where it concerns race relations. They fail to see that the close association of young white and Negro children in schools and other places, is just another way of teaching young children that race is un-important—that race is just a fallacy.

In this Nation, we think we have religious freedom. And we do except with Atheists. All persons, regardless of race, creed, or color have the right to worship God as their own conscience dictates; and they also have the right to raise their children up according to their own faith—this right being made secure by no one being forced to send their children to a church of another faith.

But who would dare say that we had religious freedom, if all people of all religious faiths were forced to send their children to the same church of any one of the many religious faiths for their religious instructions. You know what would happen in a case like that. When these children grew to be men and women, in most cases, their religious faith would be that of the church that they were forced to attend for their religious education. If they were forced to attend a Catholic church, most of them would be Catholics; but if it was one of the many Protestant faiths, or any one of the many other religious faiths that exist in this

world—no matter which it was—the one that they were forced to receive instruction from, most likely, would be their religious faith through life—most often, we are what we have been taught. So, under circumstances like this, there would be no religious freedom; because there can be no free choice under forced instructions.

Neither can there be racial freedom where white and Negro children are forced to associate together in schools and other places. The mere fact that white and Negro children are forced to associate together is a form of instruction—a forced form of instruction that will cause most white children to lose their racial pride. And once children lose their racial pride, when they grow into manhood and womanhood, they become fit subjects for inter-racial marriage. Not because of their free choice; but because of forced close association with Negroes. Yes, racial freedom is an impossibility where there is forced association.

But the Supreme Court has said, in effect, in the School and other desegregation decisions, that the white race must associate with the Negro race, so what can we do about it? There is but one answer to that question: Let us work with all our might to get those decisions reversed. We are in the right; we have the evidence to get those decisions reversed; and they will be reversed, if we will only put our every effort to the task that confronts us. Let us take heart in what the Negro has done. To say that there is nothing that can be done—just because the Supreme Court has spoken—is to acknowledge defeat. This the Negro never did in all the days that the Supreme Court held that segregation was constitutional.

In 1896, the Supreme Court held that separate but equal schools were constitutional. The re-action of

Negroes to this decision was not to say that the Supreme Court has spoken, and there is nothing further we Negroes can do about that decision. No, instead of saying that nothing could be done, they went to work; they did something; and after a lapse of 58 years, that decision was reversed. How did they do it? The answer to this question is simple: With the help of the Communists, they molded the minds of the American people to serve their purpose, the Communists being the brains of the whole scheme, working behind the scene. By sneaking into our higher institutions of learning with their racial propaganda, the Communists have been able to serve both the Negro and their own cause at the same time. This they have done well. They have worked long and hard over a long period of years; by their racial propaganda, they have misled a large segment of the American people; they are well entrenched; and the work necessary to undo what has been done will be long and hard. But we are not helpless; we are well armed—well armed with proof—convincing proof, that disproves every theory that has been advanced in the support of racial desegregation; and that in the end, will restore racial freedom in these United States.

In the name of equality, racial freedom has been destroyed. Now, in the name of liberty, we must restore racial freedom. We have the weapons to do the job, if only we have brains enough to use them. So, how best to use the weapons that are at our command, is our major problem. In other words, how can we best get our message to the American people; and we must get it to all the people of this Nation. Because we are too few in numbers here in the South to get the job done by ourselves. So, we must have means to get our message to all parts of the Nation, other-

wise failure stares us in the face. So, it boils down to this: In some way, or some how, we must get the message of our crusade to the people of the North, to the people of the East, and the people of the West—if we can do this, we win, otherwise, we lose. It is as simple as that. The plain fact is that we must have help outside the South.

But under present conditions, we can get no help from other sections of the Nation. Outside the South, all organized forces are against us: The press and other means of communications are against us; and both the Democratic and Republican Parties are against us—in plain words, the people in other sections of the Nation who believe as we do have no way of letting it be known to the Nation. Why don't we make a way? Yes, we can make a way.

Men, as a rule, discard things when they become useless to them. Many times, we all do not wish to part with things that have served us well; but at times in our lives, this becomes necessary, if we are to move forward—the old being discarded for the new, if conditions make it necessary.

A political party is an organization. As an organization, a political party is useful, or is of service to the people who support it, only, if the fundamental principles of that party are in agreement with the principles of the people who support that party.

So, when any people support a political party whose fundamental principles agree with theirs, then that party becomes an "instrument" of usefulness to them—it becomes the "vehicle" which carries to all parts of the Nation the message that tells what they believe in; and it tells it to all the Nation, and if need be, the world, why they believe in such principles.

But if a people supports a political party whose

fundamental principles are different from theirs, then that party is of no service to those people—in fact, it becomes a “stumbling block” in their “pathway”—the “pathway” that would lead others to better understand their problems. This is true, because no person, or any political party will go so far as to do that which will be harmful to the cause which they believe in.

Today, the fundamental principles of the National Democratic Party are not in agreement with those of the Southern people. This alone, makes it impossible for the National Democratic Party to be of any useful service to the South; but it is not satisfied to just do nothing for the South—it is doing the South much harm—it has and is, right now, working for the things that will destroy the freedom of the South—its racial freedom. Yes, the party that the South calls its own has become useless in the South's struggle to preserve its way of life. Instead of being the “vehicle” to carry the message of the story of the principles for which the South stands, and why the South believes in those principles, the party of our fathers ridicules the South before the Nation and the world.

No political party is worthy of the support of any people, if that party will not support the principles of the people who support that party. And we see and know that the National Democratic Party is not proclaiming to the Nation and the world that our Southern way of life should be preserved. But this is what the party of our fathers should be doing, if it is to be worthy of our support.

So, as things now stand, the South has no organized force in the North, the East, or the West to fight its battles—to tell the whole Nation why racial segregation is not discrimination against the Negro; to tell the whole Nation why racial segregation does not

violate the "Gospel of love and human brotherhood"; and to tell the whole Nation, that to force the white race to let Negroes come into the white race, make themselves at home, is no different in principle than forcing a man to let some other man come into his own home, and make himself at home. In the first case, the white race would be destroyed; in the second case, the man's home would be broken up and destroyed; and in both cases, liberty would be destroyed—liberty of the white race on one hand, and liberty of the man on the other.

So, it is: the South is not represented in the Nation, outside the South. Then, is it any wonder that we are losing our freedom? What else can we expect, not being represented throughout the Nation?

But you may say that the South is represented in Congress by its Senators and representatives just like any other part of the Nation, so what are you talking about? Yes, this is true; but the fact remains, that unless the party that you belong to agrees with you on fundamental issues, you will not be represented throughout the Nation, as you would be if your party was in agreement with you. It is like this: In the days gone by, most Democrats believed in a low tariff; and most Republicans believed in a high tariff. So, in those days, in all parts of the Nation, the need for a low tariff was proclaimed by most Democrats; and, likewise, the need for a high tariff was proclaimed by most Republicans; and because of this, all sections of the Nation were well informed on the tariff issue—in those days, the tariff issue was a fundamental issue—it concerned the whole Nation. Likewise, today, the racial issue is a fundamental issue—it concerns the whole Nation. But outside the South, both the Democrats and the Republicans are straining their every

effort for racial integration. This leaves the South with no organized force—in the North, in the East, or the West—to “carry the ball” for racial segregation. How can we be so dumb? Because, so long, as we continue to support the National Democratic Party, just so long, we will be without an organized force to carry our fight into all corners of the Nation for racial segregation. This we must have—we must have help outside the South—otherwise the fight is over.

The choice is ours. What shall we do? There is but one logical thing to do: reorganize our forces—reorganize our forces on grounds, so that the people in other parts of the Nation, who believe as we do, can join us. If we can do this, then we will have the means to carry our message to all parts of the Nation. But if we are to do this, a new political party must be born—a National Party—a party that those people in other parts of the Nation, who believe as we in the South do, can join. Yes, there would be people in the North, East and West that would join us if they had something to join. But as things are now, they have nothing to join that can be of any help to the South. Who is to blame for this? We are.

Although the numbers of a new political party—outside the South—might be small, it would furnish a nucleus from which to grow—a central point from which the message of the South could be distributed to all parts of the Nation—this is what we must have.

But we are told that if we leave the Democratic Party, then we will lose our seniority rights in Congress; that at the present time, men from the South hold important committee chairmanships in both the Senate and House of Representatives; and that we must hold on to these positions. But may I ask, what have we gained by holding on to our seniority rights?

The answer to this question can be but one thing: We have lost our freedom. Then, may I ask, having lost our freedom, while holding on to our seniority rights, how can we hope to win our freedom back by "traveling down the same road?" This looks like an impossibility. So, it just does not make sense, if we keep "travelling down the same old road."

But again, we are told that we cannot do anything by forming a third party—that a third party has never got any where. But may I say, that all who believe this, that they should take a refresher course in United States history. Because there was one third party that changed the whole course of events in this Nation; and with the right kind of backing, it is possible that another third party can, once again, change the course of events in this Nation. At least, it is worth a try; we have nothing to lose.

For many years, this Nation was in turmoil, before the Civil War, over the question, as to whether or not slavery should be extended into new territory. The South wanted the right to take their slaves into any new territory that was opened up for settlement; and the North opposed any extension of slavery into any new territory. From 1820 until the Civil War, several compromises were made on this question. The compromise of 1820 admitted Missouri as a state into the Union as a slave state, but excluded slavery forever in the rest of the territory included in the Louisiana Purchase, north of the southern boundary of Missouri. The Mexican War added new territory to the Nation. This brought on the compromise of 1850 over the extension of slavery into this new territory, resulting in admitting California into the Union as a free state; and leaving the question of slavery in

the rest of the Mexican Cession to the local inhabitants to decide.

The Ordinance of 1787 excluded forever slavery in the Old Northwest territory north of the Ohio River. But the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, another compromise, permitted the inhabitants of the territories of Kansas and Nebraska to decide for themselves, whether or not their state was to be slave or free. This bill was passed in March, 1854, and as all the other compromises, it made it possible for slavery to be extended into new territory. So, there seemed to be no end as to where the extension of slavery would come to a halt. But in the North, there were men who were determined that slavery should not be permitted to be extended into any more territory. With this determination, these men formed a new party—a third party—the Republican Party.

This new party—a third party—went places, because it stood for a principle—a principle that was right. Because slavery was wrong then; it has always been wrong; and it is wrong today.

Slavery is as wrong today as it was in 1854, when this new third party—the Republican Party was born. But something has happened to change the Republican Party's attitude toward slavery since 1854. Then, it was the Negroes, who were slaves—they were the slaves of white men—forced to do services for white men. The Republican Party was opposed to this—opposed to slavery.

But how things have changed. The Negroes were freed—they are now free. But now, the men and women of the white race of this Nation have been made slaves—slaves for Negroes. Because, as I have pointed out, the white race is being forced to associate with Negroes in schools and other places; and that

this close association of the races will in the end result in inter-racial marriages, resulting in the amalgamation of the races. This is what the Negroes want—this is a forced service for Negroes by the white race. Call it what you may, a forced service is slavery. And the National Republican Party, as well as the National Democrat Party, is working for the enslavement, not only of the people of the South, but all the Nation. Surely, they know not what they are doing—they have been blinded by propaganda for equal rights, failing to realize that there can be no equal rights to anything, any where, or at any time—where there is not an equal legitimate interest—without destroying the rights of those to whom the legitimate interest belongs. And all the legitimate interest—the racial characteristics of the white race—belong to no one, except the white race. Therefore, within the white race, the Negro can have no legitimate rights. But Negroes, themselves, acknowledge that close association of the races will bring about inter-racial marriages. So, forced association of whites with Negroes can do nothing but destroy the liberty of the white race.

Yes, things have changed since the 1850's. Then the North was organizing a new political party—a third party—to stop the extension of slavery into new territory. The North was right then, but the North is wrong now; the South was wrong then; but now, it is the South that is right.

Now, the South is faced with a problem of stopping the enslavement of the white race of this Nation. The survival of the white race of this Nation, and probably of the world, depends on what is done now. In all history, no greater principles have ever been involved in any crusade than those now involved in the crusade

in behalf of racial freedom. So, if the battle cry: Negro slavery shall not be extended into any more new territory was sufficient for a third party victory in the 1850's; then surely, the battle cry for freedom—racial freedom for the white race should be more than sufficient to carry a third party to victory in the 1960's.

Yes, the going would be slow. We could not expect victory over-night. But if you are going somewhere, you must travel toward your goal, otherwise, you will never get there. The National Republican and the National Democratic parties are not going our way—they are headed in the opposite direction from the goal that we are seeking. So, if we are ever to expect to reach that goal—racial freedom—we must look for another "vehicle" in which to make our journey. At the present time, there is no "vehicle" available for the journey. So, we must make one—a third political party.

To be effective, a third party must be national in scope—it must include the whole Nation. To this end, I call on the people of the whole Nation—the people of the North, the people of the South, the people of the East, and the people of the West—to form a new political party—a party that will stand for racial freedom. By doing this, the "roots" of racial freedom will take roots and grow throughout this Nation, resulting, once again, in racial freedom for the white race, and all other races.

Self preservation is the first law of nature. So, if we, the people of the South do not think that there are people in the North, in the East, and in the West, who will not join the South in its fight for racial freedom, then, we are only fooling ourselves. All that is needed is the means to carry the message of racial

freedom to them. A National political party—though it might be small to begin with—is the only “vehicle” that will carry that message to the whole United States. And once the message is understood by others outside the South, the numbers for racial freedom will grow. So, a party founded upon racial freedom, will not be a splinter party that will wither away and die after a short duration. A party founded upon a worthwhile principle, lives on—the right to racial freedom is a worthwhile principle.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSIONS

All through this book, I have tried to emphasize these things: That no person—regardless of who he is, rich or poor, high or low; regardless of race, creed or color—that person should have no rights—where he does not have a legitimate interest; that no person is entitled to equal rights, except in those things where he has an equal legitimate interest; and that any person, who is given any rights, to any thing, where he does not have a legitimate interest, that person is not given any rights, because no person can be given any rights where he does not have a legitimate interest. Where a person does not have a legitimate interest, only a special privilege can be given. And a special privilege is not a right—it is a favor.

Upon the following principle hinges the right to liberty of all men; and without it being strictly adhered to, no man's liberty is secure: Give all men rights—in or to all things, both tangible and intangible—where they have a legitimate interest, all according to their legitimate interest; then deny all men any rights, in anything, where they do not have a legitimate interest, then all men will have the right to freely exercise all their legitimate rights—this is liberty.

Upon this principle, the right to racial segregation is based; and upon this principle, we, the people of the white race, have the legitimate right to demand racial segregation.

As I have stated several times, all the things—the

racial characteristics—that make the white race what it is, are God given, because the people of the white race are born with them. Being born with these racial traits, gives the white race all the legitimate interest and all the legitimate rights, in all things, where it concerns racial matters of the white race.

So, it should be conceded—as a National Policy—that in all things where it would affect the racial affairs of the white race, there Negroes have no business. Because, as we have seen, Negroes have no legitimate interest in the things that affect the racial affairs of the white race; and where there is not a legitimate interest, there should be no rights.

So, when whites are forced to associate with Negroes in schools and other places, that is not giving Negroes equal rights; that is giving Negroes a special privilege—a special privilege at the expense of the liberty of the white race. Give the white race all its rightful rights concerning racial matters within its own race, then the white race will have racial freedom; and racial freedom carries with it the right of racial segregation.

If Negroes would only realize and concede the right of racial freedom to the white race, then both races could live in peace, and under the same government; and then both races could work in harmony for the common good of both races. But without racial freedom, there may be forced racial mixing; but there can be no racial peace under these conditions.

But the forces that are clamoring for racial integration are saying: that more than two thirds of the world's population belongs to colored races; and that in our dealings with these colored people, racial segregation is hurting our prestige with them; that our in-

fluence with them is not what it would be—only, if we had complete racial integration.

But this is not true. Racial segregation is not hurting the prestige of this Nation. But what is hurting the prestige of the United States with the colored people of the rest of the world is this: Because of false propaganda by the forces that would destroy the government of this Nation and the world, the colored people of the world have come to have a misconception of what racial segregation really means. They have been made to believe that racial segregation is racial discrimination; and that wherever racial segregation exists, there colored people do not have equal rights with white people. So now, let us tell these people the truth.

Let this Nation proclaim to the world the truth about racial segregation: Let this Nation tell the world, that racial segregation means racial freedom—the freedom that guarantees to all races the right, of each and every race, to develop its talents and abilities, within its own race; and the right of each race to perpetuate its own race, without molestation from any other race. Then let the world know that the forcing of the white race to mix and mingle with colored people, does not give equal rights to colored people; but instead, it gives them a special privilege; and special privileges are not permitted in the United States, because this Nation was founded upon the principle of “equal rights for all, special privileges for none”—equal rights for both white and colored races.

Tell these things to a freedom loving world; live up to them, then the world will recognize that in fact, this Nation is the “Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave.” This would put the world on notice that the people of the United States were “Brave”

enough to stand up for their rights; and then—and then only—will the prestige of this Nation rise; and when we do this, nations like Russia will respect the United States, but not before. No, racial segregation will do no harm to the prestige of this Nation—if the world knows the truth.

Neither Jefferson or Lincoln believed in slavery; but both believed that once the Negroes were free, that it was not possible for whites and Negroes to live in the same country under the same government; and both these great Americans believed that the best thing to do with the Negroes—once they were free—was to colonize them in another country. But this was not done; we still have the Negroes with us; and in some way, whites and Negroes must live in the same country and under the same government. But the two races can never live in peace together in these United States—without racial freedom—the freedom that will guarantee that the two races will not be forced to mix and mingle in any of the various walks of life. So, Negroes and whites, who are working for racial integration, must, in some way, be made to understand that racial freedom is the foundation—and the only foundation—upon which racial peace can be built in this Nation; and that the attempt to build racial peace on any other foundation will, ultimately, fail.

Racial integration is contrary to the laws of nature. In all nature, of all the many and various kinds of birds, each kind separates itself from all other kinds; and in the animal kingdom, each of the many species, seeks its own kind. This we call instinct; and this instinct of birds and animals to separate themselves from others of the bird or animal kingdom, as the case may be, must be God given; and this God given instinct is proof that God is a segregationist—it is

proof that it is the will of God that all creatures created by God should remain as He created them; otherwise, birds and animals would not have this natural wisdom—the wisdom which is so necessary—if the various kinds of birds and animals are to be perpetuated upon this earth.

But in man, there is a difference that birds and animals do not have. Man, not only has the power of instinct; but man has the power of reasoning. And because of this, God did not rely, alone, upon the instinct of man to perpetuate the different races of mankind. But instead—God, by His word and actions—proclaimed to the world that He demanded the racial integrity of all races. This God did by demanding racial purity from the Hebrew people and by His actions, by separating all races by natural barriers. And by demanding racial purity from the Hebrew people, God let the world know that He required racial integrity from all races. This is true, because the Ten Commandments and all other commandments of God in the Old Testament, were at first addressed, only, to the Hebrew people. Therefore, if the Ten Commandments and other commandments of the Old Testament apply to all people, then the commandment that was addressed to the Hebrew people for racial purity, likewise, applies to all people—otherwise, the whole Bible is the greatest hoax ever perpetrated upon all mankind. But the Bible is not a hoax, so we must concede that God's command to the Hebrew people for racial integrity applies to all people.

The right to racial segregation is based upon the **RIGHTS OF MAN**. And the **RIGHTS OF MAN** must be grounded in this principle: That no man should have any rights where he does not have a legiti-

mate interest; and based upon this principle, no man, or any group of men, will have any rights to things that belong, only, to an individual—an individual person, or an individual group of persons. When this principle is finally recognized—and some day, it will be—then the Negro race will not be permitted to force the white race to associate with the Negro race, because the white race is an individual—an individual race; and as an individual race, the white race is entitled to all rights that all other individuals have; and when this is done, the white race will have racial freedom.

Racial segregation is right, because, only, with segregation can all the races be kept relatively pure; and without segregation, sooner or later, all races will be amalgamated into one mongrel race. And as I have already proven—by facts that cannot be disputed—that all mongrel races that have been made by mixing diverse races—are inferior races, as compared to the races that were mixed to produce the mongrel races.

Equal rights do not mean that all persons, or all races have the right to exercise all their rights at any place, or—in some cases—in the association with just anybody. Because, in this Nation—in many cases—a person has the freedom of choice with whom he will enjoy his rights. For instance, all men have the right to own a home and raise a family; but no man has the right to go out and force any woman that he may choose to come into his home and be his mate. Because, if this was permitted, the freedom of choice of a life partner of all women would be destroyed. Likewise, all Negroes of this Nation have the right to as good schools for their children as white people do for theirs. But to force white children to go to

school with Negro children will destroy the freedom of choice with whom white children associate with of every white child in these United States. Such conditions as these are un-thinkable; but this is what is being forced upon the white people of this Nation today. Because white people are being forced to associate with Negroes regardless of their choice.

In this Nation, every man is free to own a home. But unfortunately, some men own much better and finer looking homes than others. And no doubt—in some cases at least—a man's prestige would be raised in the eyes of many people and he would feel more important himself, only, if he could move out of his humble home and into the more finer home of his neighbor, and make his home there with equal rights. But in these United States—at least so far—no matter how inferior it may make a man feel to live in his lowly home, no man can move out of his home into the better home of his neighbor. Yet, upon this same principle, the Supreme Court desegregated the schools of this Nation—desegregated the schools because—said the Court—it made Negro children feel inferior to go to their own schools. Therefore, if the Supreme Court can force white people to let Negroes come into white schools, because the Court thinks that it makes Negro children feel inferior to go to their own schools, then the Supreme Court can force all men with better homes to let all men with lowly homes come into their homes, because there can be no doubt but that the man in the humble home must feel inferior to the millionaire—at least in some respects. So—call it what you may—the leveling process that is being used to force Negroes and whites to associate together in schools and other places, is nothing but pure and simple Socialism. Because—if we are to com-

pletely eradicate the feeling of inferiority in this Nation, then there can be no classes: There can be no rich or poor; there can be no blacks and whites—all must look alike, feel alike, be alike, and act alike, otherwise, someone will still feel inferior. And the Supreme Court on May 17th, 1954—by its School Desegregation Decision—set in motion the machinery that will in the end bring about a classless society in these United States. That decision was the first attempt—by court order to eliminate the feeling of inferiority in this Nation; and to think it was done by forcing white people to associate with Negroes. So, if white people can be made to associate with Negroes in schools for the purpose of eliminating the feeling of inferiority in Negro children, then there is nothing to keep the Court from saying that white people must take Negroes into their homes for the same purpose. And this can end in nothing but a classless society—the goal of the Communists. All this is Communism in action.

And Communism is in action in these United States, because the Communists have been able to infiltrate our every walk of life—our schools, our churches, our many various organizations, and all other places where human beings gather. And the Communists have been able to infiltrate our every walk of life with their atheistic doctrine, because the belief in a living God was first undermined, by the teaching of the un-Godly theory of evolution in our institutions of learning, including the theological institutions of this Nation. And all this has been made possible by the simple fact that all those who have been sponsoring Communism, evolution, and all other doctrines of atheism, have been able—without any restraint—to teach them in all our institutions of learning; while at the same time, the

teaching of the story of creation—as told in the Bible—cannot be taught in the public schools of this Nation. To teach the Bible, is to teach religion; and religion can not be taught in the public schools of the United States, so say our courts, because this would be un-constitutional. But what is religion? The answer to this question should not be too difficult. Because in spite of the great number of what we call religious faiths, it boils down to this:

Whatever a man believes, or does not believe—when it concerns God and His works—that is that man's religion. So, the man, who believes that God is the Creator of the universe and all the things that are in it, together with all His other works, that is that man's religion. While on the other hand, the atheist, who does not believe that there is a living God; but who believes that the universe and all things that are in it came about in some mysterious way; and who believes that man and all living things evolved—by chance—from a single cell from the slime of the ocean—all this must be the religion of the atheist, because these are the things that the atheist does not believe about God. And if the things that one man believes about God and His works are that man's religion, then the things that another man does not believe about God and His works, must be that man's religion—it cannot be anything else.

Therefore, if it is un-constitutional to teach—in the public schools of this Nation—the religion of those who believe in a living God, then it should be un-constitutional to teach—in the public schools—the religion of those who do not believe in a living God. But such is not now the case. Because the atheist is free to teach his religion in the public schools of this Nation; but those who believe in a living God cannot teach

their religion in the public schools in these United States. The atheist is able to teach—in public schools—the story of creation by evolution; but those who believe in a living God cannot teach—in public schools—the story of creation by God as told in the Bible. So in view of these facts, there is no wonder that so many preachers are preaching Creation by evolution, instead of Creation by God. And there is no wonder that so many of our better educated people of this Nation are clamoring for the end of racial segregation: The atheist is permitted to teach—without restraint—creation by evolution in the public schools; while creation by Divine Power, is not permitted to be taught in the public schools of this Nation; and the effect of this has been to cause many persons to lose their racial pride. And this in turn has made it possible for the Communists to infiltrate our institutions of learning—including our theological institutions—with their racial equalitarian one-race, one-world, classless society philosophy. Because you cannot get away from the fact that we are mostly what we have been taught. And here in the United States, we have been teaching one side, only, of the story of creation in our public schools—that is creation by evolution. And no man is capable of rendering an impartial verdict, unless he is as well informed on one side as he is the other. So, in view of these facts, there can be no doubt but that the teaching of the theory of evolution in our schools has played a major role in causing the racial un-rest that exists in this Nation today.

I have not written this book in an atmosphere of hate, because I am no Negro hater. I am no better than any other man, regardless of race, creed, or color, who tries to be a man. But I belong to one race

and the Negro belongs to another; and in my way of thinking, each race should have the right to live within its own race without interference—when it might affect the right of the other race to perpetuate its own race—from any other race. And the association of whites and Negroes together, will in the end mean the end of both races.

And the believing in racial segregation, does not necessarily make any man a Negro hater. I have never heard Abraham Lincoln called a Negro hater, yet Lincoln's own words prove that he believed in racial segregation. On numerous occasions, Lincoln made statements that left no doubt of this. In a speech at Springfield, Illinois, on June 26, 1857, Lincoln said this:

"There is a natural disgust in the minds of nearly all white people at the idea of indiscriminate amalgamation of the white race and the black race . . .

"A separation of the races is the only perfect preventive of amalgamation; but as immediate separation is impossible the next best thing is to keep them apart where they are not already together.

"If whites and black people never get together in Kansas, they will never mix blood in Kansas. This is one self-evident truth.

"A few colored persons may get into the free states in any event; but their number is too insignificant to amount to much in the way of mixing blood . . .

"Such separation, if it is ever to be effected at all, must be effected by colonization . . . The enterprise is a difficult one, but 'where there is a will there is a way' and what colonization needs most is a hearty will . . ."

Then in a debate with Stephen Douglas, at Ottawa, Illinois, on August 21, 1859, Lincoln declared:

"I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and black races. There is a physical difference between the two, which, in my judgment, will forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality; and inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position."

And then when Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, he proclaimed to the Nation and the world what he thought about racial segregation and what he thought should be done about it in these words:

"My Emancipation Proclamation was linked with this plan. There is no room for two distinct races of white men in America, much less for two distinct races of whites and blacks.

"I can conceive of no greater calamity than the assimilation of the Negro into our social and political life as our equal . . .

"Within twenty years we can peacefully colonize the Negro and give him our language, literature, religion, and system of government under conditions in which he can rise to the full measure of manhood.

"This he can never do here. We can never attain the ideal union our fathers dreamed, with millions of an alien, inferior race among us, whose assimilation is neither possible nor desirable."

Thus spoke the great Emancipator—not in hate—but because he believed that the only way to prevent the Negro and white races from being amalgamated into a mongrel race was to keep them separated. This Lincoln proclaimed to the world, because he believed that racial integrity was best for the Negro race; that racial integrity was best for the white race; that racial

integrity was best for the welfare of all these United States; and that racial integrity was best for all mankind.

Therefore, if racial integrity was good for the welfare of this Nation a hundred years ago, then there is no good reason why racial integrity is not for the best interest of these United States today. And if the separation of the races a hundred years ago was the best means by which to prevent the mixing of the blood of whites and blacks, then there is every reason to believe that separation of the races today is the best means by which to maintain the integrity of the races. And on the other hand—the best means by which the races may be mongrelized—is to force them to associate together in schools and other places. Nothing can be plainer than this. So, it boils down to the fact that if we are to have racial integrity, we must have racial separation.

And if we are to believe the Word of God, we must concede that the separation of the races is in accord with the will of God, because He has commanded all living creatures to "bring forth after its kind. (Gen. 1:24) So, if we leave out all other considerations, this one command is more than enough to prove that it was God's plan—in the beginning—for all races to be segregated during the duration of time. Because nothing can "bring forth after its kind" if it is mixed with something else.

Neither have I written this book—believing that my race, the white race, is the superior race—in all respects—to all other races. This I believe, because I do not believe that there is anything—within its field—that is superior, or the inferior—in all respects—to all other similar things. So, it may be that one man is superior to all other men in some respects; but

no man is superior to all men in all respects, regardless of what race he belongs to. And just as no man is superior to all other men in all respects, no race of mankind is superior to all other races in all respects.

But just as all men have special talents, so do each of the various races; and each race can best develop its own talents within its own race; and when it is not mixed with a diverse race. This I have shown to be a fact by producing evidence that proves that all mongrel races that were produced by the mixing of diverse races are inferior races—as compared with the races that were crossed to produce the mongrel races.

But the right to racial segregation by the white race is not a question, as to whether or not the white race is superior to the Negro race; but on the other hand, it is a question of "Rights"—the rights of man—the rights of the white race—without being molested by the Negro race—to perpetuate its own race. And racial segregation is justified because it conforms with the laws of God; and race-mixing is wrong, because it violates the commands of God for racial purity. This it does by making it impossible for each race to "bring forth after its kind," as commanded by God of all living creatures.

Therefore, it must be more than obvious that racial freedom—the freedom that would give, each and every race, the right to perpetuate its own race, without interference from any other race—is a God given right. But the Supreme Court—by forcing whites and blacks to associate together in schools and other places—has denied the white people of these United States this right. But this right must be restored; it must be done by the Supreme Court reversing its decision, declaring racial segregation un-constitutional. And to

you—if there are any—who think that this cannot be done, remember this:

In 1896, the Supreme Court declared that segregated schools were constitutional. Then for fifty eight years we had segregated schools; and we would have segregated schools today—only if all Negroes, after this decision was made, had said: The Supreme Court has spoken; so, there is nothing that we can do. But all Negroes did not say this. They believed that something could be done; and after working for fifty eight years, that decision was reversed—they did something. And this the Negroes—with the help of the Communists—were able to do by telling half truths, concerning all phases of race mixing. By doing this, they have brainwashed the American people. And this they have been able to do by molding the minds of the young of this Nation to suit their purpose; and to accomplish this, they have made use of all our institutions of learning, of which I have already explained.

So—now, we the people who believe in the integrity of the races, must undo all this. We must—by telling the whole story and the whole truth—concerning all phases of race mixing—convince the whole world that race mixing is wrong; that race-mixing is contrary to the laws of nature and the laws of God; that forced race-mixing denies each race its God given right to perpetuate its own race; that the results obtained in experimental work done in crossbreeding of both plants and animals, prove, beyond a doubt, that the uncontrolled mixing of diverse races of mankind, can result in nothing but inferior races; and that both past and present historical facts prove—that down through the ages—that the mixing of diverse races—have resulted in producing inferior races, as compared to the unmixed races that were mixed to produce the mongrel

racess. The reason for all this, I have already explained in the chapter: **THE RISE AND FALL OF NATIONS**, and needs no further explanation.

But with all this vast amount of proof, at our command, concerning the evil and harmful effects of race-mixing to all mankind—if we will only use it—in the not too far distant future, the white race will, once again, have racial freedom. And once the white race has racial freedom—and the Negro race concedes this right to the white race, without hate, or malice—then, and then only, the two races can work together—without hate, malice, or prejudice—for the common good of both races. Good race relations is this simple; and may we all—both whites and blacks—work for this goal.

THE END